

SAVAGE INGRATITUDE

How The Jewish Left And The Protestant Elite Sabotage America

Copyright © 2007 Ari Ben-Tzvi

Listen to the radio show: <http://libertynewsradio.com/wire/hosts/ben-tzvi.php>

Visit Ari's site: <http://savageingratitude.net/>

To Those Who Went Through:

Life in Hell

Shot and Shell.

Fire and Ice

Lead and Lice.

—My gratitude

Translation of archaic Hebrew from front cover:

“And the Lord said unto Moses,
Go get thee down; for thy people,
which thou broughtest out of the land of Egypt,
Have corrupted themselves...” Exodus 32:7

Cicero

To the Roman Senate 63 BC

First Oration Against Cataline

For how much longer, Catiline, will you abuse our patience? How much longer will your madness mock us? What limit have you set to your unbridled audacity...?

Do you not see...

the guards posted at night on the Palatine Hill?

Do you not see...

the watches posted throughout the city?

Do you not see...

the alarm of the people and the coming together of all good men?

Do you not see...

the precaution taken of assembling the Senate in this most defensible place?

Do you not see...

the looks and grim faces of this venerable body here present?

Does this move you not at all?

Do you not feel that your plans are detected? Do you not see that your conspiracy is already arrested and made powerless by the knowledge everyone here possesses of it? What is there that you did last night, what the night before-where you were-who was there with you by pre-arrangement? Do you think we don't know all this? What plot did you hatch there that you think we are unaware of?

What a time this is! What decay! The Senate is aware of these things; the Consul sees them; and yet this man lives. Lives! Not only lives, he even comes into the Senate. He takes part in public deliberations; he is watching and marking down and checking off for slaughter every individual among us. And we, gallant men that we are, think that we are doing our duty to the republic if we keep out of the way of his frenzied attacks!

You ought, O Cataline, long ago have been led to execution by command of Consul. That destruction which you have long been plotting against us ought to have already fallen on your head....

NOTICE TO ALL READERS

Because the Introduction provides the background material essential to understand the body of the text, I strongly advise reading it before proceeding to Chapter 1.

Notice to any readers who may prefer an abridged version of the text:

The following schedule will provide an essential summary of the principle ideas in the text:

Introduction

Chapter 1

Chapter 16

Chapter 26

Chapters 32-39

Conclusion

Introduction

Problem

If there were no problem, there would be no need for this book. The problem is that the Liberty that we enjoy is at risk. The risk is not from foreign invasion, or domestic terrorism. The risk is from internal assault upon the principles that serve as the foundation for our liberty. We are at risk of losing freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of association, and all of the other rights which we have enjoyed for over two centuries. The necessary precondition for all these rights is private ownership of property; absent this, all the other rights, satellites of the first, will collapse. We enter the twenty-first century in possession of liberty; will we leave it, and our descendents, with as much?

I am a Jew. As such, I am a member of a race that has suffered more than any other race from the lack of liberty. I am also of the race that has benefited the most from the enjoyment of liberty. Reason would predict that the greatest champions of liberty would be those of my race.

In fact, the reverse is true. In the United States, at the onset of the twenty-first century, the most lethal threat to liberty is the Jewish Left.

My purpose in writing this book is to explore this enigma.

A warning to mainstream Jewry: We ignore the Jewish Left at our peril. Most of us are too engaged in life to be consciously aware of their actions and the extent to which they pollute our image. I remind mainstream Jewry of the old truism: Trotsky makes the revolution, but Braunstein pays the price.

Caveat: let no one think that only Jews form the threat from the Left. The reality is that most members of the radical Left are not Jews, and that what the Jewish Left have been able to do could not have been done by them alone. This book also explores the role of the Protestant Left, which worked and works synergistically with the Jewish Left. However, my chief concern will be with the Jewish Left. Let the Protestants bury their own.

The Old Paradigm

Although we Jews are, and have been always been, highly educated, the behavioral pattern we have evolved to preserve our race is as old as the race itself. This pattern is remarkably resistant to change. We came into being as a people small in number.

We came to live in a land (the Palestine Coast) that is exposed to mighty empires to the south, north, and east. To the west of Palestine stretches the Mediterranean basin, open to trade, but also to assault by any maritime power. The classical exposition of the behavioral pattern that I call the “Old Paradigm” is the story of Joseph in Egypt. In one form or another, we have repeated it from his time to our own. In the next few paragraphs I will present the paradigm as clearly as I can. But we, Jew and Gentile alike, must all acknowledge the force that drives this behavior. It is a product of the four-thousand-year-old longing for safety and security. Fear, not evil, is the motivating force.

Now for the primeval story that serves as prototype. Joseph was the leader of a small tribe which came to sojourn within a large nation. As a minority that wished to preserve its unique culture, to refuse to assimilate, the Jewish people became the archetypical “other.” To preserve “otherness” and be safe—that was the problem. Joseph’s success with Pharaoh was noted by the leaders of the Jewish people. They gleaned from his experience that the best way to ensure survival was to identify, and then to befriend the highest power in the state. To befriend a multiplicity of lesser powers would be expensive. It would also be dangerous in the face of the ever-shifting alliances of secondary powers. So the most efficient path to safety is to be at the foot of, or better yet, behind, the throne. The goal would be to become indispensable to the ruling power, to be its most loyal ally.

There follows from this predictable sequelae. One is the support of the person of the autocrat. (In this case, Pharaoh). This includes support of the office of the autocrat. Through the ages we will see that the Jews in the Diaspora acted according to this pattern. From this followed the support for those measures and policies that served to transfer power from lower to higher levels of government. In the course of this history, we will see many examples that confirm this. In our time and place, perusal of any daily newspaper will confirm that the Jewish Left is the most dependable supporter of the

process of upward concentration of power, whether it be from city to county, county to state, or state to federal levels.

The New Wrinkle

As a consequence of the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century, there was an addition to the paradigm. It occurred as a consequence of the new definition of citizenship. What was added to the definition of citizen? Whether we look at the despotisms of Central Europe, or the proto-democracy of the First French Republic, a new idea was gaining currency. This was the belief that all citizens were, or should be, equal before the law. A citizen's status before a court of law should not be conditioned by his religion, class, or wealth. That, at least was the theory, and its appeal was rightly very strong. Any contentions in violation of this precept were hard to defend in serious discourse. Theoretical acceptance, of course, was no guarantee of universal practical application. But the ideal could not be rejected by fair-minded thinkers. Transferring the ideal to the everyday would make for a stunning advance in the status of European Jews.

Following closely on the heels of the Enlightenment came Karl Marx. If he could be described as a child of the Enlightenment, he would be its most prominent bastard. With him, the logic of equality took a giant step. If equality before the law is good, wouldn't equality in everything be better? But here the logic fails. Equality before the law is the precondition of liberty; equality in all things is a precondition for tyranny. Equality in all things, which can be voluntary in a religious community, can occur in the secular world only at the point of a bayonet. But it is easy to see how Marx would fall into this error. Seekers usually discover what they already believe.

Despite his atheism and burning hostility toward Jews, he was still a Jew, and his driving force was still the fear common to most secularized Jews. Paradoxically, it was his very Jewishness that informed his political philosophy. In essence, he tried to make a world in which all differences would disappear; in a world of enforced uniformity Jewishness could not possibly be a threat. Viewed from this perspective, he could be considered the most Jewish of Jews. The price, of course, is that if no race, nationality, religion, or self-defined culture is allowed to exist, Judaism itself also is over. Fear drove him to not only accept this solution, but to embrace it.

Marx begins by elimination of private ownership of property. Hence there is no difference between rich and poor. Marx considers the family unit to be a tool of oppression against women and children; hence marriage and family are abolished. Children and spouses are to be held in common. Adults may live together, or separate, as their urges dictate. All boundaries of race, religion, and creed are to be abolished. Sameness must rule. Today's Left continues his work. They expand the scope of that which is to be leveled by mandating no difference between fully abled and handicapped, and young and old. They seek to redefine marriage to include same-sex couples, but this is a ploy to further weaken the institution of marriage. Their plan is so to degrade marriage, that when they finally reveal their goal of abolishing it, there will be so little left to defend that the rest of us won't bother to do so. The mentally ill and mentally retarded are "mainstreamed," meaning that the educational and social norms are reduced to the lowest possible level. Although average and gifted children pay the immediate price, society pays in the long run. In the public schools, competitive games are

discouraged. Racial quotas not only dictate job and academic placement, but require specified worksite and academic outcomes. The old Chinese proverb, “all one under Heaven” applies here. The goal is to create a gray sameness, with everyone (except the administrators) as much alike as possible. A leveled society seems to offer the greatest degree of safety for a threatened “other.” Leveling also provides the authorities with a simple creed which appeals to the human emotion of envy. Envy is sanctified by being recast as “fairness.” This cynical manipulation of the masses is the greatest deception of modern times.

We now come to what I call philosophical Marxism. Accepting all the above, it is but a short step to define out of existence any difference between moral qualities. The questions regarding right and wrong, good and evil, ethical and fraudulent cease to have any meaning. The glue that holds civilized society together has been dissolved. The final apotheosis of the loss of all moral compass is the presumption that there is no moral superiority of man over animal. At this point, we have reached nihilism, and suicide, individually or as a species, becomes an option. In Western Europe, the population decline below replacement level is a manifestation of suicide at a national level.

So much is the creation of an apostate Jew and his followers. What is at base the creation of a frightened Jew seeking safety has grown into a rationale so elaborate that one may easily lose sight of its original purpose and fail to appreciate its underlying simplicity. Even its authors were overawed at their own creation, blinded by their own version of the golden calf.

The Frankenstein Effect

Now for the critical question: Did it work? No, it has never worked. Sooner or later, it invariably turns on its creator with homicidal fury. Eventually there will arise a “Pharaoh who knows not Joseph.” The ruler may have other titles, such as king, emperor, kaiser, or general secretary. Having helped collect the reins of power and having put them into the hands of the autocrat, those enablers of tyranny have done their job. The tyrant has no longer any indispensable use value for the tools that put him in power. Gratitude plays no role in an amoral society.

The American Miracle

A little over two centuries ago, a new nation came into being that melded the culture of Athens and Jerusalem into a unique whole. Our founders produced a living whole, one that has the capacity of self-correction without self-destruction. For the second time in human history, a nation came into being by self-definition. We defined ourselves into existence. (The only other instance was the self-definition of the Hebrew nation at the foot of Mt. Sinai.) The new American nation was open to all who wished to work, with no test of religion or ideology. Out of many we made one, but the one was the one of inclusion.

Now I can point out the failure of the Jewish Left. If we are charitable, we can say that it has failed to recognize that its old pattern for self-preservation is no longer necessary under the uniquely novel conditions of the New World, that the old behavior is atavistic and stereotypic, and is not applicable to this time and place. If we are less charitable, we can say that the Jewish Left recognizes the unique social order in this New World, but out

of unbridled arrogance has decided to mutilate what is into its perception of what should be. What we the people think is immaterial. That the majority do not wish to go down an uncertain road toward an uncertain end carries no weight with those who believe in their own self-arrogated moral supremacy. Is that how an immigrant minority, saved from extinction by the inherent goodness of a unique culture, shows its gratitude? It seems so.

Riding Two Horses (or trying to)

I address here the most common source of puzzlement about Jews in the eyes of non-Jews. The question asked is: "How is it that so many Jews are on the left, and at the same time, so many Jews are such successful capitalists?" Even more puzzling is that so often this duality may be seen in one and the same person. The contradiction is only apparent. All human society has to solve the problem of the production and distribution of goods and services. The problem is no less real for command economies than for market economies. In market economies, the forces of supply and demand are permitted to regulate production and distribution. In Socialist/Communist societies, these decisions are made by the nomenclatura. (The nomenclatura are the privileged bureaucrats of the Socialist state.) It is the presumption on the part of the Jewish Left that they will fill the positions in the nomenclatura. So nothing has really changed at the top; as Shakespeare might have said, "a boss is a boss is boss."

Purposes

By the time you have read this book, I hope my purposes have been met:

1. To explain to the Christian Right that their favorable vision of Jews as taken from the Old Testament cannot be applied uniformly to the Jews of today.
2. To solve for Christians supporting Israel the enigma of anti-Zionist behavior on the part of the Jewish Left.
3. To make clear to all Christians that the Jewish Left makes use of Christian guilt regarding the Holocaust. In so doing the Jewish Left stigmatizes legitimate criticism as "anti-Semitism." Further, to make known that the Jewish Left has its own degree of responsibility for the ravages of the Holocaust and therefore that its use of the event for its own purposes is to dishonor the actual Holocaust victims.
4. To embarrass mainstream Jewry into breaking its wall of silence regarding the destructiveness of its left-wing brethren.

Ingratitude

The AIDS virus attacks the human body by neutralizing its immune system. Its ill effects are mediated by using the body's resources against the body itself. In the instance of this virus, there is no moral issue involved. It cannot be called cunning, deceitful, or even evil. The nature of programmed behavior is adequate cause for exemption from moral censure.

What about destructive behavior that is intentional and purposefully aimed at destruction or mutilation of the host body? The contention of my book is that such a case exists here, with the Jewish Left being the chief destructive force. The behavior is especially heinous in that it is so solipsistic. The Jewish Left can only think of their own welfare and set no

limits on the “collateral damage” they will inflict on the greater society. Yet it is this free society that saved these very Jews from annihilation!

This behavior, for which I can find no parallel in political history, can only be described as—

Savage Ingratitude!!

CHAPTER 1

THE FORMATIVE YEARS

PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY

There are many factors that contribute to the culture of a people, and they are not all operative for all cultures, and the weight of their influence is not uniform across cultures. In the evolution of the Jewish culture, the factor of insecurity has been of primary importance. A look at a topographical atlas of the eastern Mediterranean basin shows that the Mediterranean Sea has as its eastern border a straight north-south shoreline running from modern-day Egypt to the south, up to modern-day Turkey to the north. This shore, which is made up of Israel, Lebanon, and Syria, is the focus of the first part of our story (map I). Since there is no generally accepted term for this stretch of land, I will refer to it as Palestine. Our specific interest will be in ancient Israel, the southernmost of these three states. I will variously refer to it as Israel, the Holy Land, or by its Hebrew name, Eretz Israel (in Hebrew, Eretz means land).

But before discussing Eretz Israel further, we return to the physical map of Asia, looking at Egypt. Flowing out of east Africa is the Nile River, giving Egypt a very fertile south-to-north strip of land. This river and its valley are the lifeblood of Egypt (map I). Looking far to the north, at the opposite end of the coast of Palestine, is the Anatolian plateau, surrounded by mountain ranges. The runoff from these mountains produces the Tigris and Euphrates rivers (map II). As in the case of Egypt, these rivers create a valley of fertile land of enormous agricultural potential. Among historians this area is variously called “Mesopotamia” or the “Fertile Crescent.” In contrast, when we look at the coast and plains of Palestine, we see no such water source. So, two rich agricultural areas are separated by a long stretch of relatively arid land. Dating back to prehistoric times, the agricultural potential of Egypt and Mesopotamia allowed large populations with enough surplus wealth to support powerful kingdoms with large military potential. Thus were created two mighty rival empires, separated by a stretch of relatively arid and lightly populated land.

Given the human propensity for war, it was inevitable that these two empires should clash. The natural battleground was Palestine. The inhabitants of Palestine could count more on war than on water. The mindset of weak peoples situated between two strong empires is soon conditioned to deal with and make the most of positional weakness. Thus the earliest Jewish history is marked by the presence of geographically determined vulnerability.

A little more geography of Eretz Israel will be necessary to understand what is to come. Looking at the physical geography of Eretz Israel once again, on the whole it looks like a

corridor running north-south and forming the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea. A closer look reveals that it is actually three north-south strips running parallel to each other. Going from west to east, that is from the Mediterranean coast inland, the first corridor is the coastal plain, which being flat, is easy for people (or chariots) to traverse. About thirty miles inland, also stretching north-south, is a chain of mountains. The third corridor is the land east of the mountain chain and contains bodies of water fed by the runoff from the mountains. Going from south to north, these bodies are the Salt Sea, the Jordan River, and Sea of Galilee.

The distinctions are important because the routes on either side of the mountain chain were trade routes for international commerce. The western route along the sea (Via Maris) facilitated Mediterranean trade, while the route east of the mountains (King's Highway) served trade involving the Red Sea (map I). The mountain chain, being the least hospitable, hence the least populated, was also the least well defended. Thus it was destined to become the initial focus of Hebrew settlement after the Exodus from Egypt.

Such was the land. Who were the people? There is an enormous amount of scholarly work regarding the early Hebrews, the review of which is beyond the scope of this book. Various sources place the time of Abraham from between 2100 BC to about 1800 BC. He came from people of nomadic shepherding tradition. These people came to Eretz Israel from farther east and adopted a more settled lifestyle. As most readers know, Abraham's grandson Joseph was sold into slavery in Egypt. The story of Joseph in Egypt becomes the prototype of a Jewish history repeated for five thousand years.

JOSEPH IN EGYPT

The Book of Genesis relates how Joseph came to be in Egypt and how he came to be the favorite of Pharaoh.

40. Thou shalt be over my house, and according unto thy word shall all my people be ruled: only in the throne will I be greater than thou. 41. And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, See, I have set thee over all the land of Egypt. 42. And Pharaoh took off his signet ring and put it upon Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his neck; 43. And he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had; and they cried out before him, Bow the knee: and he made him ruler over all the land of Egypt. (Genesis 40:40–43: 40)

His family was also provided for:

The land of Egypt is before thee; in the best of the land make thy father and brethren to dwell; in the land of Goshen let them dwell: and if thou knowest men of activity among them, then make them rulers over my cattle. (Gen. 47:6)

In the course of the famine years Joseph was a very capable steward of Pharaoh's interests. He acted as a very effective power in increasing the wealth and power of Pharaoh:

13. And there was no bread in all the land; for the famine was very sore, so that the land of Egypt and all the land of Canaan, fainted by reason of the famine. 14. And Joseph gathered up all the money that was found in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, for the corn which they bought: and Joseph brought the money into Pharaoh's house. 15. And when the money failed in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, all the

Egyptians came unto Joseph and said, Give us bread: for why should we die in thy presence? For the money faileth. 16. And Joseph said, give me your cattle; and I will give you for your cattle, if money fail. 17. And they brought their cattle unto Joseph: and Joseph gave them bread in exchange for horses, and for the flocks, and for the cattle of the herds, and the asses: and he fed them with bread for all their cattle for that year. 18. When that year was ended, they came to him the second year, and said unto him, we will not hide it from my lord, now that our money is spent; my lord also hath our herds of cattle; there is not ought left in the sight of my lord, but our bodies, and our lands: 19. Wherefore shall we die before thine eyes both we and our land? Buy us and our land for bread, and we and our land will be servants unto Pharaoh: and give us seed, that we may live, and not die, that the land be not desolate. 20. And Joseph bought all the land of Egypt for Pharaoh; for the Egyptians sold every man his fields, because the famine prevailed over them: so the land became Pharaoh's. (Gen. 47:13–20)

The episode related above regarding the relationship between Pharaoh and Joseph will serve as the pattern of Jewish relationships to heads of state during the whole of Jewish history: the self-protective behavior of a people who are a small minority in large state.

An identified minority as such is at constant risk of negative discrimination, ranging from moderate inconvenience to outright annihilation. Lacking the numbers necessary for self-protection, it identifies the greatest source of Power in the land and makes itself useful to that Power. It helps to enrich that Power and to aid it in centralizing authority in the hands of that Power. The Jewish minority will be shown, in the course of history, to exercise keen judgment in seeking out the greatest Power, such as Pharaoh, rather than secondary sources such as the nobility or the clergy.

The wisdom of such discriminating choices provides a double benefit to the minority. It is far easier to please one master than many, and also the Supreme Master has the ultimate authority. It is thus the most parsimonious use of resources on the part of the suppliant minority. There is also benefit to the Supreme Power: He is able to use an identified minority (The Jews) as a tool in doing unpopular work, and thus to a certain degree the Supreme Power is shielded from the resentment and anger of the masses, while enjoying the economic benefits procured for him by a third party. He also has created a bureaucracy whose loyalty toward himself is guaranteed in proportion as the resentment of the masses toward the Jew removes from the Jew any security independent of the Supreme Power. Another advantage to the Supreme Power is that he can do without the Jew, but the Jew cannot do without him. It is a marriage of unequals.

The risks to the Jewish minority are obvious and great, and, unfortunately, after varying amounts of time, occur with depressing certainty. The peasantry develops an intense hatred toward the Jew because of his role as executor of the pecuniary and power demands of the Supreme Power; and the Supreme Power is only too happy to pocket the money and avoid the blame. Reading above the complete devastation of the Egyptian peasantry, it takes little imagination to guess its attitude toward Joseph and his family.

The other great risk, which ultimately goes from possibility to near certainty, is that Pharaoh no longer knows Joseph. In the case of Egypt, historians have postulated that the story of Joseph occurred during the course of rule in Egypt by a nonnative (Hyksos)

dynasty, which was subsequently overthrown by native Egyptians. That is why Pharaoh did not know Joseph.

To generalize, the “court Jew” helps the monarch centralize power and wealth in the hands of the state (which is usually under the control of an autocrat). Then, at a subsequent time, the autocrat (or central power) finds that Jew(s) have either served their purpose, or for some other reason are no longer useful or desirable. The Jews may even have become a political liability, or the autocrat may need a scapegoat for failed domestic or foreign policies. Sometimes the autocrat needs money or is in debt to Jewish bankers. At such time, the autocrat uses the power of the state (which he obtained with Jewish help) to harm Jews and Jewish interests. I call this the “Frankenstein Effect.”

THE BEGINNING OF A PEOPLE

It is difficult to overstate the importance of the events at Mt. Sinai. That was the time and place of the most defining moment of the Jewish people. According to the Jewish Encyclopedia:

The Exodus from Egypt was a divine act which preceded the revelation at Sinai, the dwelling place of the God of Israel where the Torah [Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy] was given. According to tradition, the essence of Israel’s uniqueness as the chosen people was expressed at the revelation at Mt. Sinai... various analytical trends... see in the revelation at Sinai those historic days when the tribes were consolidated into a nation and their monotheistic belief purified under the leadership of an outstanding personality—Moses.¹

The Torah provides a history that serves to unite the people, as well as the revelation of God’s will. The origin of the word Torah is related by Rabbi Daniel Silver below:

Torah comes from the root yarah, which originally meant “to throw” and came to denote the casting of lots, specifically casting lots to discover God’s will. In the Bible, the noun Torah defines the specific terms of God’s will and embraces many roles and duties. A torah was a commandment the community accepted as divinely ordained, and therefore, obligatory.²

Thus all of the laws found in the Five Books of Moses (found in Torah) are binding on observant Jews. Obedience to these laws formed a binding force holding the community together. It also helped to define Jewish particularity, i.e., emphasizing its separation from other peoples. There was no injunction to proselytize, the community considering itself a closed body. As we shall see in future chapters dealing with modern times, particularism became anathema to those forces promoting scientific socialism, of which the writing of Karl Marx is the most clear (and most fateful) example.

But there was something more than the written Torah. There was also an oral Torah, referred to in Hebrew as Mishnah. Tradition relates that the laws of Mishnah were related by God to Moses at Mount Sinai, but were intentionally not written down. The Mishnah, despite its oral form, was not considered any less authoritative than the written Torah; in fact, certain ancient and medieval scholars considered it more authoritative. The impact of the Mishnah as the key to the development of Rabbinic Judaism will be very important and will be explored in depth in future chapters. Just note here that Mishnah and its derivative works will serve to de-emphasize the role of the written Torah in ages to come,

with serious consequences to Judaism and to non-Jewish cultures affected by Rabbinic Judaism.

One further event at the base of Mt. Sinai marks the seriousness of the people's responsibility to accept Jehovah as the only God of Israel. The Israelites had just spent four centuries in a polytheistic culture; undoubtedly they had witnessed the regular practice of numerous native Egyptian cults, and it would be reasonable to presume that some of these practices had made their way into the folkways of the people. Thus when they felt abandoned by Moses in the middle of a desert, they directed Aaron to make for them another deity: "...make us gods, which shall go before us; as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what has become of him" (Exodus 32:1). In addressing the 19th century AD, we will see that a god does not have to be tangible. An ideology can do as well.

1 Encyclopedia Judaica. 1st ed., sv "History."

2 Daniel J. Silver, *The Story of Scripture* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1990), 73–74.

CHAPTER 2

THE MAKING OF A NATION

JUDGES: CONSOLIDATION

WITHIN THE TRIBES

If the Exodus was an ordeal, the Conquest of Canaan was no less so. Depending upon sources, some time in the 13th century BC, the Israelites arrived at the frontier of their new land, at Kadesh-Barnea in the northwestern Sinai. There were available the three routes (or corridors) referred to in chapter 1. From the point of terrain, the coastal route along the eastern shore of the Mediterranean would have been the easiest. But there were two obstacles: strong Canaanite fortress in the Negev and a string of Egyptian fortresses in the flat coastal plain beyond. These Egyptian fortresses served Egypt in its ongoing conflict with the Mesopotamian power of that time, the Hittites.

In approximately 1274 BC, a great battle (Battle of Kadesh) took place between Pharaoh Rameses II and the Hittite ruler, Muratalli II. It occurred on the Orontes River in northern Syria (map IV). The location gives some indication of the extensive power of Egypt at that time, implying control of the coastal trade routes along the eastern coast of the Mediterranean. No small Semitic tribe could hope to successfully challenge such large powers as Egypt or the Hittite Empire. As a result, the Israelites broke into Canaan in the easternmost corridor, skirting the Dead Sea and entering through the Amorite kingdom of Hesbon. There was general chaos in the whole region due to the rivalry of the Egyptians and Hittites, and this chaos among local kingdoms served as opportunity for the Israelites.

In general, the Conquest proceeded from the south to the north, going up the less-defended area east of the mountain chain, and probably avoiding direct conflict with the Kingdoms of Edom and Moab for the time being (map IV). After passing the Dead Sea, they were able to follow the Jordan River up to, and beyond, the Sea of Galilee. In the initial stages of the Conquest, the Israelites kept to the hill country, because of the fortresses and chariots of the Canaanites. Interestingly, even at this early date, long before

the conquest was complete, the separation of Eretz Israel into two kingdoms is foreshadowed by geographical and political realities:

The northern region of settlement was bordered on the south by a strip of plains (Jezreel and Beth-Shean) with fortifications ranged from Beth-Shean to Megiddo. Further, even in the territories of the northern tribes there were numerous Canaanite enclaves which undermined the unity of the Israelites; the large block of central mountains was between the Canaanite of the valleys and the chain of Canaanite fortresses in the south, starting with Jerusalem and ending in Gezer. This chain separated the central tribes from the southern tribes. Between these three blocks and the Israelite settlements in the east there was a natural border—the Jordan. Thus the Canaanite fortresses interrupted the continuity of the Israelite settlement and prevented close contact among the groups of tribes and weakened their attachments to one another. It is noteworthy that the break between the central and southern tribes was so absolute that even the most reliable sources (including the “Song of Deborah”) do not mention the tribe of Judah at all as a component of the tribal alliance during the period of settlement.¹

Slowly, the conquest advanced. At some point, it became obvious to the tribes that the lack of centralized leadership was militarily a serious, and possibly fatal, weakness. In addition, internal tribal disputes required resolution. Thus began the period of Judges. Judges served the function of leadership in the individual tribes. Apparently, they had no intertribal authority, and they did not at this point seem to provide any form of national leadership. Since the judges served as military leaders, they had no function in the absence of war. Thus they had an intermittent existence, and consequently, no hereditary rights accrued to the office. It appears that there was also a tradition of “minor judges” whose function was not military, but involved leadership within the tribe in nonmilitary issues.²

At the beginning of the 11th century BC, the conflict between the Israelites and Philistines grew more acute, as the Israelites attempted to settle the plains, and to dispute Philistine supremacy. The disadvantages of having no central authority became acute in time of war, and must have been the major compelling reason for appointing a king over all the tribes. At least that is the opinion of the authors of the Jewish Encyclopedia.³

A different view is given in 1 Samuel 8:4–19:

4. Then all the elders of Israel gathered themselves together, and came to Samuel unto Ramah, 5. And said unto him, Behold, thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways; now make us a king to judge us like all the nations. 6. But the thing displeased Samuel, when they said, Give us a king to judge us. And Samuel prayed unto the Lord. 7. And the Lord said unto Samuel, hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them...9. Now therefore hearken unto their voice: howbeit yet protest solemnly unto them, and shew them the manner of the king that shall reign over them. 10. And Samuel told all the word of the Lord unto the people that asked of him a king. 11. And he said, This will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you: He will take your sons, and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen; and some shall run before his chariots. 12. And he will appoint him captains over fifties; and will set them to clear his ground, and reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and

instruments of his chariots. 13. And he will take your daughters to be confectionaries, and to be cooks, and to be bakers. 14. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your oliveyards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants. 16. And he will take your menservants, and your maidservants, and your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put them to his work. 17. He will take the tenth of your sheep: and ye shall be his servants. 18. And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen you; and the Lord will not hear you in that day. 19. Nonetheless the people refused to obey the voice of Samuel and they said, Nay; but we will have a king over us; 20. That we may be like all the nations; and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles.

The motivation of the people is mixed; they also want to be like the other nations, and thus to reject some of their uniqueness, or “particularity.” The scriptural view emphasizes the rejection of God as the military leader, in favor of a king. In response to the people’s entreaty for a king, Samuel appoints Saul to be ruler over them.

MONARCHY: NATIONAL CONSOLIDATION

Saul was a failure both as a civil administrator and a military chief. His reign served mainly to establish the precedent of a monarchy. David, his successor, was able to establish a united state, including the tribe of Judah, which had not accepted Saul. He also established Jerusalem as the capital, and finally eliminated the Philistines as a military power. Saul realized the idea of a monarchy, and David made it a reality. David’s successor, Solomon, added prosperity and international recognition. The two antipodes of power, Egypt and Assyria (Mesopotamia), were in decline, leaving a military and trade vacuum that Solomon filled. There was trade on both the Mediterranean and the Red Sea. The Red Sea brought the Horn of Africa, including Ethiopia, into trade and cultural relations with the Jewish state. Relations with Egypt were (temporarily) strengthened by Solomon’s marriage to a daughter of Pharaoh.

Israel, lacking the natural advantages of Egypt and Mesopotamia, was able to accumulate wealth and power by trade, as Britain would do millennia later. However, unlike Britain, Eretz Israel is not an island. Also, it is situated, as noted, between two superpowers, and its coastal plain is flat, and therefore, excellent terrain for military purposes.

Another factor standing in the way of empire was Jewish particularism. No attempt was made at proselytizing. Also, there was no (official) toleration of other religions, so the accretion of vassal states would have been very difficult. Judaism would not readily accept converts and would not officially tolerate other religions. Thus the idea of empire could not work for either side of any conqueror/conquered equation. Because the Jewish people had a unique, private, and mandatory religion, the size of the state was limited. However, as history will show, the political weakness was more than compensated for by the spiritual power of Judaism; and the people could survive not only with a weak state, but, if necessary, with no state at all.

1 Encyclopedia Judaica. 1st ed. sv “History.”

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid., 586.

CHAPTER 3

SCHISM AND DISASTER

Shortly after the death of Solomon, the Jewish state split into two feuding entities. By 930 BC, the northern tribes separated from the Davidic dynasty, forming a new kingdom under Jeroboam, with its capital at Shechem (map IV). The Davidic line retained control in the south under Rehoboam, its capital remaining Jerusalem. The northern kingdom was called Israel, and the southern, Judah. Both kingdoms were subject to invasion, and invaders played off one kingdom against the other. The first invasion was by Pharaoh Shishak, who attacked from the south. He probably had some sort of understanding with the Kingdom of Judah, because he bypassed Judah to attack Israel (the northern kingdom). This raid seemed to be mainly for plunder and did not leave a stronger Egyptian presence in northern Palestine. It did, however, signal continuing Egyptian interest in all of Palestine, as this area controlled both the Mediterranean Sea and Red Sea trade routes (Via Maris and King's Highway) referred to in chapter 1.

In Mesopotamia, Assyria was in a period of decline, losing power to the Kingdom of Aram-Damascus. Aram-Damascus lay between Assyria and Israel (the northern Jewish kingdom). There were constant tensions between the four political entities: Judah, Israel, Aram-Damascus, and Assyria. Alliances were made and broken, and from time to time one of the states would be the most powerful, but there was no stability in the region. In addition, each of these separate states suffered from its respective internal instabilities. This instability continued for two centuries. Slowly, Assyria became the dominant power in the region. In 734–733 BC the Assyrian king Tiglath-Pileser captured Damascus and made the former kingdom of Aram-Damascus into an Assyrian province. At about this time, Ahaz, King of Judah, accepted Assyrian overlordship.

Now the situation got more complex, because a Babylonian Empire was rapidly gaining strength to the south and east of Assyria. Thus Assyria was under increasing pressure from the east (Babylonia) while facing constant revolts and shifting alliances between the two Jewish states. In addition, the many smaller states that had been forced into alliance with Assyria, were growing restive. The Egyptians, always interested in this area, at times tried to support Assyria in order to make Assyria a client state of Egypt. The Egyptians preferred a weak, dependent Assyria to the threat of a strong, independent Babylon. At other times, when Assyria appeared to be resurging, Egyptian policy was to oppose Assyria. Palestine had become a battlefield between Babylon in the north and Egypt in the south, with the small states being pawns in a game of great power politics and war. Assyria remained present, as a declining, but still dangerous element in this game. During one of the periodic revolts, the Jewish Kingdom, Israel, with Egyptian support, joined the rebellion (722 BC). The results were disastrous:

4. And the king of Assyria found conspiracy in Hoshea: for he had sent messengers to So, king of Egypt, and brought no present to the king of Assyria, as he had done year by year: therefore the king of Assyria shut him up, and bound him in prison. 5. Then the king of Assyria came up throughout all the land, and went up to Samaria, and besieged it three years. (II Kings 17:4–5)

Thus the northern kingdom of Israel came to an end.

DESTRUCTION OF THE FIRST TEMPLE

Assyria continued to decline as Babylon continued to grow. The center of Assyrian power (originally at Nineveh on the Euphrates River) continued to be moved west, away from Babylon and toward the Mediterranean. It eventually reached as far west as the city of Carchemish, in northern Palestine, near the coast of the Mediterranean Sea. Babylon was ruled by an energetic and effective king, named Nabopolassar. He put enormous pressure on the Assyrians, and, before his death, gave command of the armies to his son Nebuchadnezzar.

By this time Assyria had been pushed as far west as it could go and was threatened with extinction. Pharaoh Neco became alarmed, because Babylon was at the point of becoming master of Palestine, with its trade routes. As Egypt was not strong enough to dominate Palestine, it was in her interest to keep a balance of power in the area. Accordingly, Pharaoh Neco mobilized his forces to come to the aid of Assyria. During this dangerous period, the king of Judah, Jehoiakim, was put in a precarious position. A wise man once said, "When elephants are fighting, the ants had better get out of the way." The problem for Jehoiakim was that Judah was built on the "way," and a state cannot move.

In the event, a battle was fought at Carchemish in 605 BC in which the combined Egyptian and Assyrian forces were defeated by Nebuchadnezzar (map IV). It is instructive to look at the location of Carchemish on the map, in order to note how far from Egypt a pharaoh was willing to go to support trade routes and influence. As a result of this battle, Assyria disappeared as an independent power, having been made into a province of Babylon. Egypt, from now on, disappears as a significant power, never again making a successful attempt to expand into Palestine. So this date, 605 BC, marks the end of empire for two of the then contemporary world powers, Egypt and Assyria.

The kingdom of Judah was one of several small powers that were trying to maintain independence from the growing power of Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon. There was generalized resentment of Babylonian overlordship in the whole area. Accordingly, a generalized revolt by most of the small states in northern Palestine broke out. Zedekiah, King of Judah, had been installed by Nebuchadnezzar. Nevertheless, against the advice of the prophet Jeremiah, Zedekiah joined the rebellion.

Nebuchadnezzar then besieged Jerusalem. The new pharaoh, Hophra, was alarmed at the loss of all of Palestine, and sent military support to Jerusalem, but the relief army was defeated by a Babylonian force.

Thus in 586 BC Jerusalem fell to Nebuchadnezzar, the First Temple was destroyed, and the state of Judah ceased to exist. The largest part of the Jewish population was forced into exile. Babylon became the new center of Jewish life.

CHAPTER 4

AFTER THE FALL

The fall of the First Temple in 586 BC is the greatest catastrophe in Jewish biblical history. The First Temple served as a centralizing force for a fractious nation. Since it housed the Ark of the Covenant, it was considered to be the site of the Divine Presence. There were other sites of religious significance that had been set up by the several tribes in their particular areas of settlement and commanded local religious affiliations. These

sites were of variable orthodoxy, being subject to certain indigenous religious practices native to the regions prior to the conquest. The Temple served to standardize religious practice:

The growth of the Temple's importance as a religious center was bound up in large measure with the struggle against the high places, which appears to have become intensified in Judah with the political breach in the nation after the death of Solomon. During the reign of Omri the practice of idolatry gained ground in Israel, even as it did in Judah in the days of Athaliah. By the very nature of thing, idolatrous practices were concentrated especially in localities not subject to official supervision, that is, at the local high places. This brought about a sharpening of the religious conflict, which, in turn, led to an increased emphasis upon the special significance of the Temple in Jerusalem, and ultimately in the reign of Hezekiah and Josiah, to the prohibition of the use of the high places and to centralization of worship in the Temple.¹

The religion, having become that of the entire people, served to provide them with a common identity:

Primarily...the Temple was a place of assembly for the entire people for purposes of sacrifice, prayer, and thanksgiving. The people would come to the Temple to bring both sin and guilt offerings as well as burnt offerings and peace offerings and meal offerings with frankincense either in fulfillment of vows, as freewill offerings, or as peace offerings of thanksgiving...The people would come to the temple...not only from Jerusalem but from all of Judah (Jer 7:26; 26:2 cf. Ps.122:1-2) and even from beyond, from Schem, from Shiloh, and from Samaria. (Jer 41:5).²

Response to the Loss

Although the Temple could not go into exile with the people, the priestly caste could. Since the monarchy with its attendant court and nobility no longer existed, the only identifiable leadership was the priesthood. It is likely that the belief that the catastrophe was the result of disobedience to God's will was the general belief, both among the people and the priesthood. Clearly, then the priesthood had a great stake in perpetuating this belief:

Priests dominated Judean life during the exilic period and post-exilic period and were largely responsible for the governance of Jerusalem when it was resettled. One theory holds that the priests prepared the Five Scrolls from oral traditions and available documents to provide Jerusalem, when it once again became a city governed by a Judean elite, with a constitutional document that clearly stated God's will. Ezra and his colleagues believed that obedience to such a document alone could guarantee God's generous protection. Post-exilic leaders accepted the teachings of pre-exilic prophets like Amos, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, who had driven home the lesson that the national fate depended on the people's loyalty to the covenant. These leaders looked on the Exile as deserved punishment.³

The exile lasted from 586 BC until 538 BC. It appears that the exiles did well from the beginning, as Nebuchadnezzar decided to raise the children of the best of the exiled Jews to be part of his nobility. Among these favored ones were Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, who were eventually appointed by Nebuchadnezzar to high

administrative offices.⁴ It is curious that a captured people should have been treated so well.

In the years 539–538 BC, Babylon fell to Cyrus, king of the Medes and Persians. The change was more than just one of dynasty, as the invaders were of Indo-European race and spoke an Indo-European language (Persian). In that sense, the Persians were ethnically more removed from the Jews than the Babylonian dynasty that they had supplanted. Nonetheless, the exiles got on very well with the new rulers. Daniel lived into the reign of Cyrus, who evidently had great regard for him. Probably because of jealousy, other high court officials plotted to destroy Daniel. Knowing that Daniel prayed to God three times a day, these officials presented a law for Cyrus to approve, making it a capital offense to make obeisance to anyone but Cyrus for the next thirty days. Their plot worked:

12. Hast thou not signed a decree, that every man that shall ask a petition of any God or man within thirty days, save of thee O king, shall be cast into the den of lions? The king answered and said, The thing is true, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not. 13. Then answered they and said before the king, That Daniel, which is of the children of the captivity of Judah, regardeth not thee, O king, nor the decree that thou hast signed, but maketh his petition three times a day. 14. Then the king, when he heard these words, was sore displeased with himself, and set his heart on Daniel to deliver him: and he laboured till the going down of the sun to deliver him. 15. Then these men assembled unto the king, and said unto the king, Know, O king, that the law of the Medes and Persians is, That no decree nor statute which the king established may be changed. 16. Then the king commanded, and they brought Daniel, and cast him into the den of lions. Now the king spake and said unto Daniel, Thy God whom thou servest continually, he will deliver thee. 17. And a stone was brought, and laid upon the mouth of the den; and the king sealed it with his own signet, and with the signet of his lords; that the purpose might not be changed regarding Daniel. 18. Then the king went to his palace, and passed the night fasting: neither were instruments of musick brought before him: and his sleep went from him. (Daniel 7:12–18)

The text above shows that Daniel was favored by the king. It shows something else of importance. The Medes and Persians were not ruled by a complete oriental despotism. They had, to some degree, a government of laws, and not just men. It was not an absolute tyranny.

Cyrus was succeeded by Cambyses and then by Darius I (ruled 521–486 BC). Actually, Darius had been, as a prince, very close to Cyrus. It was during the reign of Darius I, in 522 BC, that a group of exiles, numbering 42,360, returned to Eretz Israel (which until 70 AD I will refer to as Judea). They began to work on what was to become the Second Temple. For various reasons, the work was delayed. In 515 BC, the Second Temple was completed and consecrated.

During the reign of Artaxerxes (465–424 BC), it happened that an exile of priestly/noble caste, Nehemiah, was made his cupbearer. Ezra was contemporary to Nehemiah. They both returned to Jerusalem in order to complete the walls of the city, but more importantly, to reestablish religious tradition, and the favored place of the priesthood in

the revived nation. It was certainly in the interest of the Persian ruler to have reliable ruling elite in a state sponsored by Persia. Rabbi Silver writes:

But what is not debated is that Ezra's activities and those of another contemporary, from the east, Nehemiah, represent attempts by the Judean aristocracy among the exiles, primarily the priests, to assert the authority of their views and practices over the Temple and the City of Jerusalem. Furthermore, Ezra, a "priest and scribe of the law of God of Heaven," and Nehemiah, a nobleman who had served as a cupbearer in the royal court, seem to have been backed by the Persian court and to have come to Jerusalem on missions authorized by it.⁵

Early on in their return to Jerusalem, Ezra and Nehemiah read The Book of the Law before the people. We do not know the contents of this book. Probably it was all or part of the Torah. Rabbi Silver points out the enormous meaning of this event:

The story of Ezra's scroll, as told by later priest-historians whose efforts are recorded in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, is significant because for the first time the community seems to have acknowledged that religious authority can lodge in a text [my emphasis]. Little in the earlier biblical records foreshadows such a change. The first group of Judeans to return to Jerusalem (c. 520) with the aim of renewing the cult had apparently not felt the need to bring a Torah type of scroll with them, as none is mentioned. In the intervening generations before Ezra's arrival, we hear of prophets who brought God's word to Judea (Haggai, Zechariah, and so on), of priests who were consulted about the oracle, and of the altar and its implements; but there is no mention that a scroll of any kind played a significant role, or any role, in the life of the community. Even later writers, like the rabbis of the Talmudic period, who assumed that the Sefer [book of] Torah had been in existence since Moses' day, sensed the novelty and the importance of the event. "Ezra was worthy of having the law given through him to Israel had not Moses preceded him" (b. San. 21b).⁶

At this moment the Temple becomes portable. Wherever the Jewish people goes, its law goes with it. Loss of the homeland no longer means loss of identity as God's Chosen People.

Joseph and Pharaoh Redux

Not all the exiles returned to Judea. In fact, more may have remained behind than returned. Life in the Persian empire was most likely more secure than in a provincial Palestinian town. In addition, many non-Jewish peoples had moved into Eretz Israel and would not welcome back the Jews (Ezra 5 and 6). Thus it was important for the Jewish elite to cultivate ties with the Persian king, leading to relationships not unlike Joseph to Pharaoh.

The classic instance of capturing the sympathy of the head of state is given in the narrative of the Book of Esther. In the first lines of the book, we learn that the empire consists of 127 provinces. It would have been impossible for Mordecai to have captured the sympathy of 127 satraps (provincial governors). He was far wiser, and targeted Ahasuerus (Artaxerxes?), who was the monarch over all. The last sentence of the Book of Esther shows the relationship of Ahasuerus and Mordecai to parallel that of Pharaoh and Joseph: "For Mordecai the Jew was second to King Ahasuerus and was great among the

Jews and approved by the multitude of his brothers, working for the good of his people and speaking peace to all their offspring.”⁷

The text of the book shows the king giving the Jews protection in an interesting way; there is no rescission of his earlier order authorizing their annihilation, which would logically be the easiest way to resolve the situation. There was obviously time to do so, as the subsequent orders saving the Jews were promulgated in time. The means of saving the Jews was to authorize them to defend themselves, and probably more importantly, the satraps were ordered to help them. This is consistent with the Law of the Medes and Persians cited above in the case of Cyrus, that once the king gives an order, even he is bound by it.

Political Power in Judea

Although the Persian kings were sympathetic to the Jews, both in and outside of Judea, they were too politically astute to allow the Judean settlers to reestablish a monarchy. The Persians left political power in the hands of the priesthood, in essence creating a theocracy. This theocracy was dependent on Persia for its authority. When the exiles were building the Second Temple, some of the surrounding peoples asked to help in building, but were rebuffed by Zerubbabal:

You have nothing to do with us in building a house to our God, for we ourselves shall together build to Jehovah the God of Israel, just as King Cyrus the king of Persia has commanded us.⁸

Note that the authority comes from Cyrus, not from God. Rabbi Silver has a terse but clear summation of the political situation: First he notes that to the returnees, Ezra’s Scroll was held in great respect “because it was based on the emperor’s authority, which Ezra used to effect certain reforms in the government of Jerusalem.”⁹

Descendents of the royal family apparently incurred the wrath of the Persians by making a bid for power during the first years of return. That experience suggested to the Persians that it might be good policy to send more compliant leaders to reorganize the troubled governance of Judea. Priests, men like Ezra and Nehemiah, who had knowledge of Israel’s law and were recognizable figures of authority, filled the bill. Priests had political ambitions, but not kingly ambitions that might trouble the peace of the empire.

This powerful and literate priest group had developed its own version of tradition which it accepted as God’s will. It now found itself with a chance to govern Jerusalem, the city where God dwelt as well as where the Temple was located, and which played a central role in the lives of Jews everywhere.¹⁰

It is clear that the new state was not only a theocracy, but a client state of Persia.

1 Encyclopedia Judaica, 1st ed., sv “Temple.”

2 Ibid.

3 Silver, 94

4 Daniel 3:12.

5 Silver, 113

6 Silver. 112

7 Esther 10:3

8 Ezra 4:3

9 Silver, 117

10 Ibid. 121

CHAPTER 5

THE HOLY BOOKS

Now we come to the development of Holy Scripture. Jewish orthodox tradition asserts that there were two scriptures handed down to Moses on Mt. Sinai. The first Scripture was written and is called The Five Books of Moses, the Pentateuch, or the Torah. I will use the term Torah because it is well-known among non-Jews and will avoid confusion during the course of further discussion. (The Torah alone does not include the other material listed below under Tanakh; it is limited to Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy.)

There was, by orthodox tradition, also an Oral Torah, communicated by God to Moses. This Oral Torah was not redacted (written out) until well after the redaction the First Torah.

There is considerable debate relating to the date of canonization of the Old Testament, which is beyond the scope of this book. In any event, the Hebrew name for the Old Testament is the Tanakh, and it consists of three parts: (1) the Five Books of Moses, (2) the Prophets, and (3) "Writings;" i.e., Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Chronicles. This is common knowledge to Jews and Christians.

What is obscure to almost all Christians, and probably to most Jews, is the history and content of the Second Scripture. As noted above, orthodox Jewish tradition has it that the contents of the Oral Torah were transmitted to Moses by God at Mt. Sinai at the same time as He gave the written Torah. The Oral Torah was intentionally unwritten; in fact, it was for a long time forbidden to write it out. It was to be memorized. What is this oral Torah? The name for it, when it was eventually written out, was the Mishnah. Unlike the Pentateuch, which is largely narrative, i.e., stories, histories, and parables, the Mishnah is a series of laws regulating every aspect of community and personal life. It is boring reading. In Hebrew the term for narrative text, i.e., stories, is aggada. The term for legal writing is Halacha. Thus the Pentateuch is aggadic, and the Mishnah is halachic. Henceforth, as a convention, I will use the word Torah only to refer to the Pentateuch. For the Oral Torah, I will use the term Mishnah. One of the primary, if not the primary, functions of the Mishnah, is to provide a catalogue of laws that would otherwise have to be sought out in various places in Torah. It could be described as a legal abstract of Torah minus the aggadic content.

The Mishnah helped to solidify the authority of the priestly class, as they alone had access to the content of a book that had not yet been written. Any question the people had of interpretation of the law had to be viewed in light not just of Torah, but also of

Mishnah. Only the priests could do that. Rabbi Silver's insightful comment is, as usual, pithy and enlightening:

Limiting advanced study to direct contact between master and student and keeping the texts oral contributed significantly to the success of the key elements of the rabbinic agenda: it concentrated interpretive authority in the hands of the masters and prevented the growth of any significant challenge to their agenda and authority. The sages controlled not only the subjects discussed in the schools but the terms of any debate. There were sages who challenged another's authority, but apparently no challenge resulted in any debate about the authority of the second scripture.¹

Even in the case of Torah alone, conflicting opinions of the data within Torah may be held. Similarly in the case of material within Mishnah...How much more so with apparently conflicting readings between Torah and Mishnah? There is enough confusion here to keep cadres of priests employed for centuries. And so it did!! The big question was, and remains today among orthodox Jews: Which of the two sources is more authoritative? Surprisingly, Mishnah.

By the fourth century (AD), the concept of the two Torahs had been broadly accepted. The image is of equal elements; but in actual practice, the sages gave their oral Torah the greater weight. It served as the basis of their educational and legal decisions. Despite the ceremonial care which they treated the Sefer Torah, [Pentateuch] they did not hesitate to declare flatly: "In three areas the halacha [God's law, as they taught it] overrides a specific scriptural instruction" (Urbach 1975, p 294). Illustrations of this attitude can be multiplied: "The covenant was made at Sinai only on account of the oral Torah" (b. Git. 60b). "Both written and oral laws have been proclaimed and we cannot tell which is the more precious, but since it is written 'Al pi [literally "by the mouth of"] these words I have made a covenant with you and with Israel' (Exodus 34:33). 34:33), we infer that the oral Torah [literally, the Torah by mouth] is the more precious" (j. Peah 2:4). Indeed, the regimen of rabbinic Judaism during its formative centuries was singularly free of any bias toward structuralism.²

At this point in my narrative, I am going to jump ahead seven centuries to discuss the further evolution of sacred writ. Following chapters will fill in the gap of the eras of the Greek conquest, the Kingdom of Judea, the Roman conquest, and the destruction of the Second Temple in AD 70. I am violating unity of time in the narrative because I want to preserve the continuity of development of the Jewish sacred canon.

As stated, the Mishnah is a text of Jewish law dealing with every aspect of Jewish life, with no distinction made between secular and religious topics. It consists of six major divisions (or Tractates). They were finally redacted around AD 200 by Judah ha Nasi (Judah the Prince), a renowned scholar living in Palestine. With the passage of time, notable rabbis made commentaries on the various sentences of the Mishnah. In fact, an enormous literature grew up around the Mishnah. The commentaries were called Gemara, which means variously study, completion, or addition, in Hebrew and Aramaic. The Gemara was written from after AD 200 until about AD 500. Actually, there were two Gemara written, one in Jerusalem and one in the environs of Babylon. The Babylonian one is longer, and is, and has almost always been the the one alluded to when the word

Gemara is used. For all intents, we can make no further reference to the Jerusalem version.

One of the key facts about the Gemara is that it is never found as a stand-alone text. It is always found following the Mishnah text that it is explicating. For example, there may be a phrase of Mishnah text followed by many comments on the initial Mishnaic text. The combination of the Mishnah text with its elucidating Gemara is called Talmud. The published Talmud always follows the same pagination, so someone in the U.S. can call someone in Belgium to discuss a topic in Talmud, and the page referred to would always be identical in number and contents. We shall see in future chapters, in Jewish academies throughout the world and through all the ages, the chief interest of students and teachers has been Talmud (derived from Oral Torah), and not the Pentateuch (Five Books of Moses). The daily application of law to secular and religious questions was a living issue at all times, and an halachic (legal) document was considered more relevant to practical life than the aggadic (narrative and anecdotal) Tanakh (Bible). Almost everyone is familiar with the term kosher. This term defines what an observant Jew can and cannot eat. Other laws determine what can and cannot be done on Sabbath. The scope of these issues relates to every facet of life of observant Jews. It can thus be seen how important it would be to obtain definitive statements of what would be lawful in a changing world. In this vein, the antiquity of the various Gemara following a Mishnaic text has significance. The older a given Gemara following a Mishnaic text, the closer it is to the time of Moses; thus it will be more consistent with the principles of Judaism.

The problem is that an ancient text cannot address changing conditions over time. For example, let us say that Maimonides in AD 1190 said that a Jew may consider pastry bought from a Cairo bakery to be automatically presumed kosher. However, today, rabbinic opinion states that pastry bought at the corner bakery in Portland, Oregon, cannot be considered automatically to be kosher. The older opinion is overruled by a modern opinion, even though the older is closer in principle to Mosaic Law. Why? The difference is that a 12th-century Muslim bakery would not have used lard; whereas a 21st-century chain bakery will most likely have used lard. Therefore, while the older ruling is in principle closer the ideal, the later ruling takes into account the practicalities of the present that could not have been anticipated centuries ago. From the time of the Mishnah to the present day, rabbinic scholars have been writing updated synopses of the Talmudic guide in order to account for these temporal changes.

Consequent to the above, an observant Jew, having a question on halacha, or the religious orthodoxy of a life situation, may find the matter too complex for a layman's mind. Therefore, his recourse is to consult his local rabbi, who presumably has the time and resources to answer the question. If the local rabbi is uncertain, he is likely to write to a rabbi he considers competent to rule on such a complex issue. But there is no formal chain of appeal up to a Supreme Pontiff. This example shows that since Judaism lacks a Supreme Pontiff, the organization of Judaism is congregational, as in many Protestant denominations.

As a matter of comparative religion, we should note that Islam has its legal code, called Sharia, and it is made up of written texts encompassing the Koran, Haddithah, and Sunni. Islamic scholars settle issues of religious (and in some cases) secular issues according to these published texts. Also, in the Roman Catholic Church, Canon Law is used to make

decisions, and papal pronouncements carry the weight of dogma in Catholicism if these pronouncements are made *ex cathedra*, under the doctrine of Papal Infallibility.

1 Silver, 195.

2 *Ibid.*, 207–9.

CHAPTER 6

A NEW POWER TO THE WEST I: GREECE

Who They Were

A study of the topographical map of ancient Greece shows lands surrounded by sea, but relatively unfertile: speaking of Athens, Michael Grant states: “The territory, in Plato’s words, is a ‘fleshless skeleton’ of which the bones show through in large slabs on the bare rock. Only one-quarter of the surface of the territory was cultivated.”¹ In order to make up for this deficit, Athens was forced to become a sea power, and her merchant ships brought to the city by trade what could not be grown locally. Athens thus became an imperial power much as England would centuries later. Her military fleet was strong enough to defeat Xerxes in 480 BC at the Battle of Salamis. Two years later the harbor about Piraeus was walled, giving Athens a lifeline to the sea in the event the city were besieged.

But probably more important than the naval power was a new idea of government. Around 487 BC, in response to political instability, an organization with a large franchise, unique for its time, called the “Assembly,” was given greater power than the smaller ruling group, called the “Council.” Michael Grant describes the event:

The contemporary description for the degree of democracy established by Cleisthenes, or existing in his time, was *isonomia*, equality under the law, replacing the aristocratic hierarchic orderliness described as *eunomia*. True, the old framework had not been destroyed, but it had been overlaid by a new one; as elsewhere, the old *thesmos*, “ordinance” fixed by an authority, was now supplemented and partly replaced by *nomos*, law or custom adopted by a community as a result of its own decision. The *isonomia* of Cleisthenes, though it did not all come into force at once but emerged gradually, was a sophisticated, intricate and experimental array of new political institutions, adding up to the most democratic form of government that had so far been devised by human ingenuity, and establishing the essential features of Athenian society for 200 years.²

The other major state was Sparta, which had soil, if anything, worse than that of Athens. However, the Spartan leadership had no interest in having its citizens strive for personal wealth, as the state was a military kingship, ruled by two kings at all times. The dual kingship was to provide for leadership at once if one king were slain in battle. And given that the king would personally lead his troops, such a fatal outcome was not unlikely.

The nature of the citizenry may be gauged in the following description of the life of a Spartan boy:

Every Spartan infant was examined shortly after birth by the “elders of the tribesmen”, who rejected weak or deformed babies and ordered them to be thrown over a cliff. By the way of contrast to the emphasis on the family (*oikos*) found at Athens and elsewhere, those who passed the infancy test at Sparta were taken away from their families at the age

of seven or eight, and enrolled as members of a “herd” (like horses or cattle, requiring domestication) under the control of a senior Spartiate...they worked their way through state-controlled, state-oriented training curricula of an increasingly brutalizing nature.³

I could quote further, but it only gets worse. It has an uncanny resemblance to the training for Hitler’s SS divisions.

I think the development of two very dissimilar political and social states between two nations that shared not only similar geography, but the same language and much common culture demonstrates something important. Social organization, a function of the nature of a people, is now strong enough to override the determining power of geography and natural resources.

It was only a matter of time before these two powers, sharing the same general area, and each strong in its own way, would clash. The inevitable war, the Peloponnesian war, lasted from 431 to 404 BC. Both sides were devastated. The real winner was Philip of Macedon, who began to conquer all of Greece. Although he was assassinated in 336 BC, his more famous son, Alexander the Great, continued his policies, and became master of the known world (exclusive of China). However, Alexander did not live long after his conquests, and at his death the empire was divided among his generals. After some initial (and inevitable squabbling), Judea (along with Mesopotamia) fell to Seleucus, one of Alexander’s generals. He established himself in Babylonia in 312 BC, which marks the start of the Seleucid Empire. Judea was now subject to the Seleucid rulers.

Hellenism

Greek philosophy and religion as a whole are too complex to deal with at any meaningful depth in this book. For our purposes, the attempt of the Seleucids to impose upon Judea worship of Greek gods and the introduction of certain aspects of Greek culture, such as public exercise in the nude, are at issue. The Greek pagan philosophies such as Stoicism, Epicurism, and Platonism, are not the subject of discussion.

The Greek rulers wanted to “share” their religious culture with the subject peoples. But this was a hard sell to observant Jews. What made their program easier was the large numbers of Greeks who moved into Eretz Israel:

Among the most conspicuous results of Greek rule in Eretz Israel was the transformation that took place in the ethnic composition and organizational forms of its population. An extensive Greek settlement took place, Greek military colonies were established, and the character of the ancient cities underwent a change. In fact, the vast majority of the Hellenistic cities were ancient ones which were now organized according to the political social pattern of the Greek cities. Within a short time the members of the upper classes among the local population joined the ranks of the settlers who had come from Greece.⁴

Within a short time significant portions of the Jewish population adopted the culture of the Greeks:

In their way of life the upper Jewish classes, both priestly and lay, drew increasingly closer to the non-Jewish sections of the population, and there was a revival of tendencies which had not entirely ceased even in earlier generations: opposition to the emphasis on the uniqueness of the Jews, and a desire to merge with the upper strata of the general society of Eretz Israel...A notable outward indication of the Hellenization was the

widespread use of Greek names, of which Jews, and not only those estranged from the Jewish tradition, felt a need.⁵

It was obvious to the Seleucids that control of the state could be achieved by control of the Priesthood. Therefore, in 175 BC Antiochus IV Epiphanies appointed a puppet, Jason, to be High Priest. Jason promised and delivered:

With the Seleucid kingdom's approval Jason introduced far-reaching changes in the administration of Jerusalem, whose purpose was to transform that city into a polis, named Antiochia, by establishing in it institutions characteristic of the Hellenistic polis. Notable among these was the gymnasium, which soon superseded the Temple as the focus of social life, to the deep dismay of those loyal to the Jewish tradition.⁶

But this was not enough. In 171 BC, Antiochus replaced Jason with Menelaus. Menelaus (and his party) became allies of Antiochus in plundering the Temple's treasures, the military occupation of Jerusalem, and essentially banning Judaism:

[Antiochus] captured the city [Jerusalem]... To ensure his future control of Jerusalem he stationed in its citadel, the Acra, non-Jewish settlers who were joined by extreme Hellenists from Menelaus' party. By their domination of the citadel of Judea, the Jewish character of the city became obscured. Antiochus went a step further. He totally prohibited the fulfillment of the mizvot of the Jewish religion and any Jew found observing the Sabbath or circumcising his son was put to death. He likewise forced upon the Jewish population idolatrous rites and prohibited food, chiefly the eating of swine's flesh. The Temple was desecrated and henceforth called after Olympian Zeus.⁷

Before proceeding further, I must make clear that the Greek culture and political ethos that Alexander's empire and its four successor states brought to the world was in many ways unlike the political ideals and philosophy of Athens. Also, they could not generate the sense of nationalism and all-pervasive individual sense of participation in the identity of the state felt in the soul of the average Spartan citizen. They could not generate patriotism and an abstract love of country, because their highest ideals were power and wealth. The successors of Alexander were rapacious tyrants who fought with each other for supremacy and extended their power to any neutral or uncommitted state by any means necessary. They made and broke alliances for temporary advantage. They had become "oriental tyrants" to a greater degree than the Persian king, because they were bound by no law whatsoever. A clear distinction must be made between the Greece of the city-states and the rapaciousness of the states of the empire.

The combined results of the political tyranny and religious persecution had created a critical situation in Eretz Israel, one that would lead to armed resistance.

1 Michael Grant, *The Rise of the Greeks*. (New York, McMillan Publishing Co., 1987), 34.

2 *Ibid.*, 69.

3 *Ibid.*, 97.

4 *Encyclopedia Judaica*, 1st ed., sv "History."

5 *Ibid.*, sv "History."

6 Ibid., sv “History.”

7 Ibid., sv “History.”

CHAPTER 7

THE MACCABEES

The situation for most Jews had become intolerable. Many suffered martyrdom rather than to forsake their religion. Many, unable to resist the allure of Greek culture, converted voluntarily. Among these were dedicated Jewish Hellenists, “more Greek than the Greeks.” This adoption of an anti-Jewish ideology by Jews will be seen to recur many times in the course of the centuries. These apostates tended to become hostile to loyal Jews, to the extent of joining the armed party of non-Jewish settlers.¹ It is easier to understand the behavior of Jewish apostates by recalling that the Greek rulers had encouraged Greek settlers to move into Palestine, in order to weaken Jewish nationalism.

It was only a matter of time until armed rebellion would break out. In I Maccabees, it is notable that the first act of armed resistance involved the deaths of a Greek and a Hellenist Jew:

23. Now when he had left speaking these words, there came one of the Jews in the sight of all to sacrifice on the altar which was at Modin, according to the king’s commandment. 24. Which thing when Mattathias saw, he was inflamed with zeal, and his reins trembled, neither could he forbear to shew his anger according to judgment: wherefore he ran, and slew him upon the altar. 25. Also the king’s commissioner, who compelled men to sacrifice, he killed at that time, and the altar he pulled down.²

Following this signal event, Mattathias raised a cry for general rebellion:

27. And Mattathias cried throughout the city with a loud voice, saying, Whoever is zealous of the law, and maintaineth the covenant, let him follow me...⁴² Then came there unto him a company of Assideans who were mighty men of Israel, even all such as were voluntarily devoted unto the law...⁴⁴ So they joined their forces, and smote sinful men in their anger, and wicked men in their wrath; but the rest fled to the heathen for succor. 45. Then Mattathias and his friends went round and pulled down the altars.³

The revolutionaries are appealing to religious motivation. There is no strong rhetoric about a free country, or nationalism. The reason for seeking to overthrow the Greeks is to enable the practice of the true religion. It was just as important to rid the nation of Hellenist Jews as of foreigners and Greeks.

If there is any doubt that the motivation was primarily religious orthodoxy, the following quote should dispel it: “2:64 wherefore, ye my sons, be valiant men on behalf of the law; for by it ye obtain glory.”⁴

Eventually the rebellion succeeded, and the Greeks were driven out. The Temple was rededicated and purified. The Temple lamps miraculously burned for seven nights on a supply of oil that should only have sufficed for one night. The holiday of Hanukkah marks the reestablishment of orthodoxy. Today, witnessing a Reform or Reconstructionist Jewish service, one will hear no mention of the real reason for the season, because that would embarrass the congregants. The Jewish Left is hostile to any manifestations that might indicate that Jews consider themselves different from the

nations. They also hate orthodoxy, and atheism is common among them. It would be more honest of them to ignore the festival rather than to pollute it. They are the Hellenists of modern times. The modern counterpart of the Jew Mattathias slew at the altar of the Idol would be the Jew at the altar of Liberalism. The first Hanukkah occurred in 164 BC.

Consistent with the age-old practice of governments to give too little too late, the Seleucids decided to grant Judea full religious freedom. Then, and only then, did nationalism become the major issue. In 161 BC, Judah Maccabeus won his last battle against the Seleucids, because he fell in the next battle, in 160 BC. Over the next several years, there was much political activity, but in 142 BC the Seleucids finally gave up trying to collect taxes in Judea. Which is equivalent to saying that Judea was now independent.

During the war and political maneuvering alluded to above, an event occurred which seemed to be a mere footnote to history. Judah Maccabeus authorized an offensive-defensive treaty with Rome. He did this to weaken the Seleucids.

The alliance is described in I Maccabees chapter 8:

1. Now Judas had heard of the Romans, that they were mighty and valiant men, and such as would lovingly accept all that joined themselves unto them, and make a league of amity with all that came unto them...12. But with their friends and such as relied upon them they kept amity...14. Yet for all this [their power and conquests] none of them wore a crown or was clothed in purple, to be magnified thereby: 15. Moreover how they had made for themselves a senate house, wherein three hundred and twenty men sat in council daily, consulting always for the people, to the end they might be well ordered: 16. and that they committed their government to one man every year, who ruled over all their country, and that all were obedient to that one, and that there was neither envy nor emulation among them.⁵

The real reason that Rome wanted a treaty with Judea was due to the ongoing war between Rome and the daughter states of Alexander's empire. These states, feuding with each other, were in a permanent state of decline and would eventually fall to Rome.

After achieving independence, the new state of Judaea needed a government. To that end a great assembly took place on Jerusalem in 140 BC and sanctioned the hereditary rule of the descendents of Mattathias.

In 140 BCE a great assembly took place in Jerusalem which confirmed both Simeon [son of Mattathias] and his sons after him "until there should arise a faithful prophet" as ethnarch, high priest and commander in chief of the Jewish nation. This decision of the Great assembly became the cornerstone of the Hasmonean regime and correctly reflected the union, in the hands of that dynasty, of the functions of the high priesthood, the civil rule, and the military command, a union of functions which was characteristic of the Jewish state's entire development under Hasmonean [name of the dynasty of Mattathias] rule.⁶

In the initial years of the dynasty, the political impact of Hellenism was reversed. Military expansion extended the borders of the state from Egypt in the south to Antiochia in the north. The entire west bank and most of the east bank were part of the kingdom. (In 104 BC the title ethnarch was dropped in favor of Basileus. In Greek Basileus means

king.) It is important to recall that the ruling dynasty, the descendants of of the Maccabees, was referred to as Hasmonean.

With the passage of time many things change. As the years went by, the Hasmonean dynasty grew less and less orthodox. Holding the offices of high priest, and the secular authority, they had become politically supreme. As they became more and more Hellenized themselves, they became the natural allies of the upper classes which had previously been Hellenized. After the fall of the Temple, and the beginning of the Babylonian Exile, the power and influence of the priestly class had begun to lessen. During the Exile, a new class of religious leadership arose. This was a group of people called rabbis (explainers). The rabbis were more closely related to the common people, and unlike the priests, they did not have to be Levites. The rabbinate was more orthodox than the priesthood. The priesthood became associated with a proto-political party called the Sadducees, and the rabbinate became part of another proto-political party called the Pharisees. 7

There was thus a split in the religious community, which was reflected in the nation as a whole. What had started out as a popular rebellion to re-establish religious orthodoxy had gotten far more complicated as a result of the fusion of temporal and religious authority. Thus the seeds of much discord were sown.8

1 Encyclopedia Judaica. 1st ed., sv “History,” 628.

2 King James Version, I Maccabees.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid.

6 Encyclopedia Judaica. 1st ed., sv “History,” 631.

7 Ibid., 634.

8 Ibid., 634.

CHAPTER 8

THE ROMAN REPUBLIC: A BRIEF SKETCH

Lead-up: The Situation in Judea

By 63 BC, all of Palestine was engulfed in war. There was civil war in Judea regarding claimants to the throne. The weakened Seleucid rulers united with the Nabateans to make war on Judea. Meanwhile, the Romans, under Pompey, had taken Syria. As noted in the previous chapter, the Hasmoneans had become bound to Rome. Pompey advanced upon Jerusalem and entered the city. He took it easily because the adherents of a claimant to the throne of Judea, Hyrcanus, opened the gates of the city to Pompey’s forces. The only strong opposition occurred on the Temple Mount, and it took the Roman military three months to capture the Temple complex. Now Pompey became the arbiter of who would rule Judea and how the territories of the small states in the area would be allocated. First,

Pompey left Judea semi-independent under the rule of Roman Syria (See map IV). But very soon Judea was territorially weakened:

Judea was deprived of the whole coastal plain and of access to the sea. Part of Idumea (Marisa) [Idumea was the then current name of Biblical Edom, southwest of Judea; in Biblical times, the Idumeans had been forcibly converted to Judaism] and of Samaria was severed from Judea. In this manner the continuity of Jewish settlement in western Eretz Israel was destroyed, the only road linking Galilee and Jerusalem being now by way of the Jordan Valley. Pompey naturally freed from Jewish rule the large Hellenistic cities in Transjordan as well as Scythopolis, which were joined to the Decapolis and recovered their autonomous city life. The Greek cities on the coast also regained their freedom. The territory remaining under Hyrcanus II's rule thus comprised Judea and southern Samaria, most of Idumea, the areas of Jewish settlement on the eastern bank of the Jordan, and Galilee. Hyrcanus was divested of his royal title, and the obligation to pay taxes to the foreign government reimposed. The Jews in the country did not willingly accept the new regime and the following years witnessed frequent insurrections.¹

Regarding the kingship of Judea, Pompey made the predictable choice of Hyrcanus. Pompey's choice was based on something more than Hyrcanus' treachery to his own country. Hyrcanus was weak and indecisive. The alternate claimant (Aristobolus) had a stronger personality and would not be so easily controlled. Hyrcanus chose as his chief advisor a shrewd man named Herod. Herod was neither indecisive nor weak. This proved to be a fatal choice for Hyrcanus.

Rome

Physical Geography of Italy

On a topographical map, Italy is seen to be a long peninsula stretched on a north-south axis (See map V). Down the center of this axis like a spine runs the Apennine Mountain chain. As a peninsula, it is relatively protected from invasion from the east, west, and south by water. To the north, Italy is capped by the east-west mountain chain called the Alps. Although there are passes around and through the Alps, invaders from the north have always found these mountains to be a formidable barrier. From Hannibal in the second century BC to the Allied invasion of Europe in AD 1943, the Alps and Apennine chains had to be considered. The long Italian coasts allow Italy to face Greece and Asia to the east, and Spain to the west. Due south, by short sea voyage, lie the fertile coasts of northern Africa. Trade would be a natural consequence of this geography.

In preceding chapters we have seen how the natural advantage of well-watered fertile land gave advantage of empire to Egypt and Mesopotamia, leading to struggle from north to south, and engulfing Palestine, which had the misfortune of lying between these two powers. Rome, although far from arid, did not have the easy fertility of the Tigris-Euphrates Valley or the Nile Valley, yet created an empire that not only exceeded these, but engulfed all of Egypt and parts of Mesopotamia. The reasons for Rome's success were based on social and military organization, which ultimately, over significant periods of historical time, have proven to be of far greater importance than accidents of geography.

Political Basis of the State

Around 510 BC, the city of Rome, which had been a monarchy, rid itself of its king and became a republic. Unlike Athenian democracy, it was not a “one citizen, one vote” system. Instead, there were various assemblies which represented the people. Around 400 BC, the Roman city-state began to expand and came in conflict with neighboring Italian states. By around 300 BC, Rome could claim precedence, if not superiority, over its fellow Italian states. The Romans referred to the boundaries of their state as the pomerium, which encompassed the city of Rome and its surrounding territory.

The government they set up evolved over time during the course of the Republic. Of the assemblies that existed, the most important was the Comitia Centuriata, which represented all citizens. In this assembly, citizens were classed on the basis of their ability to arm themselves for war, and a citizen who could afford full body armor received more representation than one who could be only a lightly armed soldier. The very poor, who could afford no arms, were not permitted to be part of the army, and had much less voting power in the Comitia Centuriata. Thus the mainstay of the Republic was, at the beginning, a sturdy peasant class. They were citizens and part-time soldiers. The executive power was vested in two consuls, who were elected by the Comitia Centuriata every year. In addition to being the chief magistrates responsible for carrying out the laws, they were also responsible for leading the troops in time of war. The other important assembly was the Concilium Plebis, which included the poorest citizens, but also the large majority of citizens. Over time, the Concilium Plebis also acquired the authority to pass law. Laws passed by either assembly were binding on all citizens. Over time, many plebeians grew wealthy and many patricians became poor, so that plebeian/patrician status was no longer a predictor of one’s power in society. For a man with political or social ambition, the attainment of the highest office, that of consul, was the ultimate goal. To get there, it was traditional for a young man to pass through a series of lesser offices, in ascending scale of importance. The higher the position, the fewer places were available, so in the higher ranks competition was fierce. There was some difference in the chain of ascent for plebeians and patricians, but the highest office was open to both. The route to achieving this dignity was called the *cursus honorum*.

This system was relatively stable until a series of wars broke out between Rome and the wealthy North African city-state of Carthage. These wars lasted from 264 BC until 146 BC when Carthage was totally destroyed. In the process of the war with Carthage, Rome acquired the Carthaginian empire, which consisted of Spain, parts of what is now southern France, Sardinia, Corsica, and large parts of the North African coast.

The victory over Carthage spelled doom for the Republic. Prior to the expansion of Roman power beyond Italy, citizen-soldiers were called up for brief periods of military duty. There was still time to take care of the family farm. But with the extension of Roman power all over the Mediterranean, the day of the citizen-soldier was over. A soldier was called up for the duration of the war. These wars, which now might take years, put the soldier at risk of losing his farm, which began to happen at an alarming rate. Wealthy men bought up these small-holdings, and set up large farming operations worked by slave labor. There is more than one irony here: slaves were by now very cheap because of the victory of the Roman legions over subject peoples. The soldiers’ military success in the field of war cost them their fields at home. As wars continued to multiply,

the requirement for some wealth on the part of a would-be soldier was abolished, and all citizens, even the poorest, were liable for military service. What had been an honor had become an onerous obligation.

The republic is now doomed. Let us examine three of the chief factors.

1. Loss of the yeoman class: With the loss of small holdings, newly impoverished Romans and Italians (with Roman citizenship) flocked to Rome seeking work, or failing that, to partake of the free bread rations provided by the state for indigent citizens. Gladiatorial shows provided entertainment. An uplifting life it was not. A dangerous underclass, complete with gangs and the same social ills we know today, evolved in Rome. Politicians recruited private armies from this pool of thugs. The statement, “No one was rich unless he could pay a legion out of income” was literally true and would become increasingly so with the increase of urban poor. Just as we have rich liberals today who capitalize on human misery by bread and circuses and by blaming the rich, so their prototype existed 2000 years ago:

Finally, two new words had entered the political vocabulary which were to be important in the last century of the republic. First, the Gracchans were rather disparagingly described by their opponents as populares (“mob panderers”), a term referring to their practice of promoting their cause through the manipulation of the popular institutions and at the expense of the senate. The populares were not thrusting outsiders; they were an integral part or faction of the nobility. Not surprisingly, their opponents chose a far more honorable word for themselves—optimates (“the best men”). Again, the word does not single them out as aristocrats, but indicates their own view that a traditional approach to government, based upon the practical primacy of the senate, represented the best way. In following it, the optimates were displaying traditional values and acting in a manner consistent with ancestral custom. The politics of the late republic revolved around the optimates and populares; each contained groups of factions and ambitious individuals whose objectives remained unchanged: the acquisition and use of power.²

It is so easy to recognize some of today’s demagogues, such as Ted Kennedy, the Clintons, Jessie Jackson, or Al Sharpton.

2. The second chief factor was the military. The legions were stationed on the periphery of the empire in order to protect Italy from invaders from Gaul, Germania, Greece, and Asia Minor (See map V). The city of Rome was far from the frontier, and the flow of news from the center to the periphery could take weeks or months. A general in the field might have no idea who was in power in Rome or of any political change for months. His troops may have been isolated from Italy for up to twenty years and have lost all contact with family and friends in Italy. The soldiers’ pay was appallingly small, and they depended on Iljksdfooting and the personal generosity of their commander. There were legions in Britain, Gaul, Germany, Spain, and on the Danube. It is thus easy to understand that their loyalty toward Rome would be in competition with their loyalty to their commander. Specifically, the chief interest of a common soldier would be land. For many soldiers, a return to Rome meant a return to poverty. Far better to be given a plot of fertile land in Gaul, North Africa, Spain, or Syria.

(In the end, many of them did receive land in the provinces because it served the Roman state the dual functions of paying off the veterans and also securing the borders of Italy

from invasion. An unnoticed (at the time) result of this scattering of Italians all over the Mediterranean basin was the establishment of linguistic, cultural, religious, and legal basis of the modern nations of Spain, France, Portugal, Italy, and Romania and to a lesser degree those of the Anglo-Germanic nations. But that is the subject, not just of another book, but of entire libraries.)

3. The third chief factor was *clientela*:

The domination of the Roman governing class found expression in the institution of *clientela*, *clientship*, an archaic form of personal dependence, which survived at Rome with undiminished relevance, in striking contrast to Athens and the Greek world in general. Cicero regarded the institution as created by Romulus (*de re publica* II, 16); it placed the client in the position of being, in E. Badian's words, an inferior entrusted, by custom or by himself, to the protection of a man more powerful than he, and rendering certain services and observances in return for this protection.

Among the services rendered was political support; a man might be helped to office by the votes of his clients and by those of his friends and associates; naturally they expected him in return to deliver the votes of his clients. The ingrained habits of dependence of clients in particular and the lower orders in general emerge with dramatic clarity...

One important consequence of *clientship* was that the struggle of the Orders, of the patricians and the plebeians, was in no sense a class struggle; the plebeian leadership was rich and ambitious and part of its support came not only from those in whose interest it was to support it, but from its clients at every economic level; the patricians were similarly supported by all their clients, the humble amongst them perhaps acting against the economic interests of their class, but nonetheless bound to their patrons by real ties of shared sentiment and mutual advantage.³

I cannot read the citation above without noting how it might have been used as a playbook by Joseph P. Kennedy, Sr., in setting up the careers of his sons. He did his work with the Democratic Party machine in Boston by his own efforts and worked through Mayor Richard Daley in Chicago to secure power there. It is also very likely that he enrolled Mafia support in both cases. An additional aspect of this sort of *clientela* is the relationship between the wealthy leaders of the Democratic Party and the mass of Black voters. The Democratic Party uses the influence of its direct clients, such as the Congressional Black Caucus, to deliver the votes of their *clientela*, a mass of ignorant, angry, and easily manipulated people. This will be explored in detail in subsequent chapters.

1 Encyclopedia Judaica. 1st ed., sv "History," 635.

2 David Shotter, *The Fall of the Roman Republic* (London: Routledge Press, 1993), 27.

3 Michael Crawford, *The Roman Republic* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), 28.

CHAPTER 9

THE REIGN OF HEROD I AND THE AFTERMATH

Herod I

In the year 43 BC, Herod had worked himself up to chief advisor to King Hyrcanus II, who was destined to be the penultimate ruler of the Hasmonaean dynasty. In the same year, Herod became betrothed to Mariamne, a Hasmonean Princess. In this way Herod gained some legitimacy as a would-be successor to Hyrcanus II. As a consequence of the concurrent struggle in Rome for supremacy, Palestine was a battleground for some of the contending forces in Rome itself. There was bloody chaos in Palestine, including Judea. In this period of Roman weakness, Parthia (Persia) attacked and occupied Syria and Judea. In 40 BC, Herod went to Rome to pledge his support to Rome. Since Herod had impressed Antony and Octavius, then in power in Rome, Herod was given the kingship over Judea. At that time, however, Judea was under Parthian control. This gave Herod the opportunity to prove that he could work directly with the Romans. Herod's troops, supported by Antony's Roman legions, retook Jerusalem in 37 BC. Herod began his reign with a bloody purge of the Sanhedrin:

When he came to power, Herod took absolute control of the government by putting to death 45 members of the Sanhedrin who supported the Hasmoneans. This destroyed the political power of the Sanhedrin, which seems to have been left only with the authority of a religious court, lacking any real influence in practical legislation. He also made the appointment to the high priesthood dependent on his favor and during his reign dismissed and appointed high priests arbitrarily.¹

Herod's first priority was the political situation in Rome. He seemed to have an uncanny knack for estimating who would come out on top in the bloody fighting at the highest levels of Roman power; or failing that, to ingratiate himself to the ultimate victors.

Herod was king only by the grace of Rome, which regarded him as a convenient instrument for carrying out its policy in the East. He established his rule on the basis of Roman patronage, and with great diplomatic skill and personal charm succeeded in winning the favor of the constantly-changing Roman rulers. Herod was loyal to Antony during the period that he was all-powerful in the east... However, with the defeat of Antony at Actium, it seemed as if Herod was doomed. But unperturbed, he immediately abandoned his old friend and endeavored to join the side of the victor.²

In 22/21 BC Herod met Agrippa, Augustus' right-hand man, thus the second-most powerful man in the Western world.

In 22/21 BCE Herod went to Mitylene to visit Agrippa, Augustus' son-in-law, who was acting as viceroy in the East, and there established extremely cordial relations with him.³

Under the aegis of Rome, Herod was all-powerful in Judea, in both civil and religious matters. His only obligations to Rome were to pay taxes and obey Rome's dictate in foreign relations.

Herod had done what we have seen so often in Jewish history: as ruler of a second-rate power, he used personal ties with the highest level of the dominant power in order to do something for his people. He had already prevented the destruction of Jerusalem in 37 BC by his personal intercession with Antony.⁴ He was successful in extending Judea to its former borders. He rebuilt the Temple on a massive scale:

To dedicate his loyalty to Judaism, he decided to rebuild the Temple. He erected a splendid edifice to take the place of the previously unpretentious building, at the same

time extending the boundaries of the Temple mount. About 10,000 commoners and 1,000 priests were occupied for nine years in building it.⁵

He also helped the people in times of famine:

From time to time Herod even showed concern for the needs of the people; in 25 BCE, a year of hardship and famine, he purchased grain for the people, distributed clothes, and supplied seed, and on two occasions lightened the burden of taxation. The productive capacity of his country was undoubtedly increased by his settlement projects, and by the irrigation works which he constructed around Jericho, and also by his securing the border regions and suppressing banditry; his building projects, too, took the form of extensive public works.⁶

Herod was also an advocate for Jews outside of Eretz Israel:

Herod was more acceptable to the Jews of the exile than to those of Eretz Israel. He intervened on their behalf several times, exerting himself with the Roman authorities. He even succeeded in obtaining the restoration of the privileges of which they been deprived by the Greek cities of Asia Minor, as well as the right to collect the half shekel for the Temple.⁷

Herod did not feel secure on his throne. He may have been paranoid; he suspected betrayal everywhere. Mariamne, Herod's wife, had a brother named Aristobolus, whom Herod was forced by political circumstances to appoint high priest. This young man was also popular with the people. He was at a swimming party with Herod's friends, and "accidentally" drowned. Herod eventually had his wife Mariamne executed on a false charge of adultery. He subsequently was so remorseful that he became seriously ill. However, he recovered from the melancholy well enough to have his two most promising sons executed. They were Mariamne's children and were educated as princes in Rome. The stench of this was appalling even to Rome. He was called to Rhodes to account to Augustus for these executions. But before he left, he had the harmless, aged ex-king Hyrcanus II put to death in order to prevent the old man from becoming ruler again if Augustus should have had Herod himself executed for murder. Somehow, he got off scot-free, but legend has it that Augustus commented, "It is better to be Herod's pig than his son."⁸

The Aftermath

Following Herod's unlamented death, his kingdom was divided into three parts for his three appointed successors. All of this was done subject to the approval of Rome.

His immediate successors were nowhere as successful as Herod in keeping Eretz Israel intact territorially. Internally, there was restlessness because of the high rate of taxation, and the Herodian princelets were unable to address it or to keep the peace. There then followed rule by a series of second-rate administrators, some of whom, like Florus, were not well-disposed to Jews, favoring the Greek inhabitants of Eretz Israel. The most well-known of these administrators was Pontius Pilate (AD 26-36).

Things went from bad to worse. The Emperor Caligula (37-41 AD) decided to order a statue of himself as a God (Jupiter) to be placed in the Temple. As a result of this, the Encyclopedia Judaica states:

It had suddenly become clear to the Jews what evil lay in store from the rule of an omnipotent individual.⁹

Unfortunately, the Jews did not learn the lesson that tyrants are dangerous, as subsequent history will show again and again. Caligula was petitioned not to proceed with this plan by Jewish delegation sent for that purpose to Rome. They informed him that

Although their religious principles made it impossible for them the sacrifice to him, they were always very glad to to sacrifice for him, which indeed they regularly did. The ruler was unimpressed, remarking that failure to recognize his divinity seemed not so much criminal as lunatic.¹⁰

Fortunately, tragedy was postponed. A Jewish prince, Agrippa I, succeeded in changing Caligula's mind. In a history which is largely tragic, Agrippa I plays one of the few positive roles. Agrippa I was the grandson of Herod I and had a way with people. Not only was he able to charm Caligula, he also was a friend to Caligula's uncle Claudius. In AD 41, Caligula's Roman guard assassinated him, making way for the unexpected accession to power of Emperor Claudius, who gave Agrippa I authority over all Eretz Israel. It was one of those propitious times when two good men were simultaneously in power and interacted to the benefit of both their peoples.

Of all the leaders of the Herodian dynasty, he alone in all his strivings gave primacy to the Jewish nation and its future, and became the most illustrious Jewish politician of his generation. The last years of his life were marked by a complete identification with the Jewish nation and with its needs as he saw them, and to this end he cooperated with the greater majority of the Jews of Eretz Israel who regarded him in every respect a Jewish king and the heir to the Hasmonean rather than the Herodian dynasty. The non-Jews in Eretz Israel looked upon him as their enemy.¹¹

The fact to bear in mind here is the degree to which the peace and safety of Eretz Israel depended on the personalities of two men and the importance of Agrippa's ability to influence the most powerful man in the world. After the deaths of Agrippa (AD 44) and Claudius (AD 54), it will be the same old story, "Pharaoh will no longer know Joseph." Very shortly thereafter, rivers of Jewish blood were to flow and centuries of exile to commence. There is no long-term security to the Jewish nation by befriending powerful rulers or tyrants. This is something an otherwise intelligent people have never learned, despite millennia of lessons. It would be horrible enough if only the Jewish people suffered from this blind, obstinate, repetitive behavior. But the whole world has had to suffer for some of its results, particularly for the Jewish role in the rise of Soviet Communism in the twentieth century. But that is for future chapters. Now to examine the political reality that made the rebellions possible (Persia), then to the actual wars themselves.

1 Encyclopedia Judaica, 1st ed., sv "Herod I."

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid.

6 Ibid.

7 Ibid.

8 Ibid.

9 Ibid., sv “History.”

10 Michael Grant, *The History of Ancient Israel* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1948), 237.

11 *Encyclopedia Judaica*, 1st ed., sv “History.”

CHAPTER 10

THE THOUSAND-YEAR STRUGGLE: EAST vs. WEST

Back to our topographical map (map IV). A look at the northeastern Mediterranean shows that sea to be capped at that point by a great mass of land, almost a peninsula. It is called variously Turkey, Asia Minor, or Anatolia. This mass of land is the northern gateway from Europe to Palestine and Egypt. It separates the Greco-Roman world from that of Persia. Immediately to the west of Anatolia, the Italian and Greek peninsulas jut into the Mediterranean (see map V). Immediately to the east of Anatolia, separated from Anatolia by the southern Caucasus Mountains, lies Persia (also referred to at various times as Iran or Parthia).

The entry, by land, into Palestine and Egypt from Europe lies through Asia Minor. So Greek or Roman involvement in this area requires passage through Asia Minor. Over centuries, ancient Greece had planted and supported colonies in Asia Minor, but especially along the Aegean coastline. Many of the islands in the Aegean were colonized by Greeks, especially the Cyclades and Dodecanese. The great islands of Crete, Rhodes, and Cyprus were major centers of Greek settlement and culture. Even today, there are disputes between Turkey and Greece regarding some of the islands, especially Cyprus.

The Persian Empire began around 560 BC with the sweep into present-day Iran of the Medes and Persians under Cyrus the Great. After conquering Babylon, and adding that city and its empire to his own, he proceeded to occupy Anatolia. Persian influence was felt as far away as the Ionian Islands, which sought Greek help to free them from Persian control as early as 499 BC. In these days, Persia was the aggressor. In 492, the Persian general Mardonius attempted to occupy Thrace, the territory due north of the Greek city-states, but was thwarted by bad weather. Then the Great King of Persia, Darius I, sent an army in 490 BC to the Greek mainland, but it was defeated at the Battle of Marathon. After the death of Darius I, the new Great King Xerxes I authorized land and sea invasions of Greece, which ultimately failed. Hostilities continued at a lower level until the time of Alexander the Great, who took the offensive. Between the years 334–331 BC, he defeated the Persians and acquired not just Persia, but also the Persian holdings in Palestine and Egypt. Alexander’s attitude toward the Jews of Eretz Israel was very benign, and he was regarded warmly by the Jewish people, as he made no attempt to interfere with their religious practice.

Alexander’s empire fragmented after his death because the successor states lacked a unifying force. Starting in 238 BC, an Iranian tribe called the Parthian, who had been settled in Persia since the time of Alexander, began a struggle for independence, which

resulted in native Parthian rule in 170 BC under king Mithradates I. This new state shared a border with Rome along the Euphrates River. Thus Rome inherited the Persian conflict from Greece. The battleground was Syria and Asia Minor.

The Fall of Rome and Persia

In AD 226, a new dynasty came to the Persian throne, the Sassanid Dynasty. However, changes in dynasty in Persia, like changes in Emperors in Rome did not remove the rivalry of the two great powers. Control of Syria and Palestine remained the key to the overland routes to Egypt and North Africa, whose rich soil became the breadbasket for Rome. Momentarily, we will jump ahead in time, sacrificing chronology in the interests of completing an idea. In AD 476, the western part of the Roman Empire officially ceased to exist as such. That left the eastern half, centered at Constantinople (see map V), as the remaining Roman presence. This entity continued the feud with Persia for control of the Anatolian plateau, Syria, and Palestine. Depending on the relative strength of the two contenders, various of these territories shifted from one side to the other. An unwelcome consequence of this struggle was the weakening of both Persia and Byzantium (another name for the Eastern Roman Empire). Thus, when a new and unexpected power arose in the East, neither was prepared to combat it.

In 630, the founder of the Muslim religion, Mohammed, captured Mecca and began to spread a new religion. The Arabs of the Arabian Peninsula, united by Mohammed and his successors and driven by religious zeal, began to push west. Realizing that the Arabs were a threat to both empires, the Persians and Byzantines combined forces in 633 to stop the Arab advance into Mesopotamia. The effort was too late, and the allies, exhausted by war against each other, lost the battle (Battle of Faraz). The cost to Byzantium was the loss of Jerusalem in 638, Syria in 641, and Egypt in 642. Persia fared even worse. Persia itself fell to the Arabs in 642, ending the Sassanid dynasty. Although these victories were incomplete and some of the conquests, at least initially, insecure, the course of world history was changed irrevocably.

The consequences of the advent of the Muslim religion and the Arab advance could be traced in an infinite number of historical directions. At this point, I will choose to follow just one minor thread in order to continue to present the idea alluded to above. After the fall of the Eastern Roman Empire (Byzantium) in 1453, the Roman Empire comes to an end.

The Third Rome

To bring this struggle to modern times, we must consider the Russian belief that it became the “third Rome” after the fall of Constantinople:

In 1453, Constantinople fell to the Turks, and the Ottoman Empire replaced the Byzantine, leaving Muscovite Russia as the only independent Orthodox realm. As the self-appointed heir of what was once a global Christian empire, Muscovy assumed a role that transcended its borders. Churchmen rushed to find ways to enhance its prestige so that it could be worthy of its new position and to justify greater power for the ruler so that he could preserve Orthodoxy from further harm. To establish a direct inheritance, Ivan [Ivan III, Grand Prince of Muscovy] married Sofia Palaeologus (b. ca. 1450), the niece of the last Byzantine emperor, and adopted the liturgical court ceremonies and the two-

headed eagle of the fallen empire, as well as the titles of tsar [Caesar] and autocrat. The clergy contributed legends to bolster Muscovy's image: St. Andrew, the Apostle, had originally brought Christianity to the East Slavic lands; the Muscovite rulers were descended from Roman emperors.¹

Another factor that came into play was the growing awareness of the Russian court of the need for a warm water port as a year-round outlet to the world's oceans. Control of Constantinople (now called Istanbul by the Turks) would meet both needs. For the next 400 years Russia will be watching Turkey like a buzzard watches a weakening prey. Russia has inherited from Rome the struggle with eastern powers for the gate to the Middle East. Control of Constantinople is the key to control of the Eastern Mediterranean. Constantinople is valuable real estate...location, location, location.

Now we get to the purpose of this exposition of Roman and Persian history: how it relates to Eretz Israel. After the fall of Israel to Babylon in 586 BC, a large number of Jews were exiled to Babylon. After they were allowed to return to Eretz Israel, following the fall of Babylon to the invading Persians, many, probably most, did not return. This was probably largely due to the favorable treatment they received by the Persian court:

Babylonian Jewry, the oldest mass-settled group of Jews outside Eretz Israel, had maintained its strength throughout the period of the Second Temple. Living since 129 BC under Parthian rule, a loosely knit semi-feudal state, it was able to develop its autonomous institutions with little interference from the royal government. The Parthians who had always to fear Roman intervention welcomed Jewish opposition to Rome [my italics], at least till the time of Hadrian, when peace reigned on the border. They left a free hand to the exilarch who headed Babylonian Jewry. Descended allegedly from the House of David, proud of their genealogical purity, the exilarchs wore the kamara, the sash of office of the Parthian officials. The community which they headed was both numerous (estimates of its number vary from 800,000 to 1,200,000, i.e., 10–12% of the population of Babylonia) and well-based economically, comprising a fair number of farmers and many traders who grew rich as intermediaries in the profitable silk trade between China and the Roman Empire passing through Babylonia. The Jews enjoyed not only freedom of worship, autonomous jurisdiction, but also the right to have their own markets and appoint market supervisors (agranomoi) [my italics]. These favorable conditions continued after the replacement of the weak Parthian kings by the much stronger Sassanids...after a period of troubles and disagreements at the beginning of the reign of Shapur I (241–272 AD), better conditions were gradually established with the king; one of the reasons for this understanding was Shapur's plans for the conquest of the Roman Empire. Jewish help could be of great value in his campaigns, and the Jews of Babylon had proved their staunch opposition to Rome in the revolt against Trajan [my italics].²

Compared to the prosperous conditions in Persia, one may assume that the rigorous life in Eretz Israel compared unfavorably. American Jews face a similar situation. Referring to Israel, they say, "It's a great place to visit, but I wouldn't want to live there."

With this background, we may proceed to the wars of the Jews against Rome.

¹ John T. Alexander, et al., eds. *Russia Engages the World 1453–1825: The Reign of Ivan the terrible 1453–1584*. (Cambridge. Harvard U. Press).

2 Encyclopedia Judaica. 1st ed., sv "History," 649–650.

CHAPTER 11

THE WARS OF THE JEWS

As noted above, the reign of Agrippa I in Eretz Israel coincided with the benign reign of the benevolent Roman Emperor Claudius. After the death of Agrippa, the internal situation in Eretz Israel was complicated by the presence of large numbers of Greeks and other non-Jews whose settlement there was encouraged by both the Greeks in their time and the Romans later. The imperial policy was to weaken the unity of the Jewish state. There was also a large number of Jews, usually of the richer classes, who were sympathetic to Hellenistic and Roman ideas. In Israel today, the Jewish Left plays an analogous role, including sponsoring programs to empower Palestinian Arabs and Israeli Muslims. We see a failed, corrosive policy 2000 years old being used again by malevolent, self-hating Jews:

The revolt also had the aspect of a social revolution, its revolutionary character being particularly prominent in those extremist groups in which messianic leaders, such as Mendham the Galilean and Simeon Bar Giora, were active. To them the revolt was not only a war against Rome. It was also a struggle against the upper classes of Judea who for many years had cooperated with the Roman regime.¹

The social revolution referred to above by Encyclopedia Judaica is misapplied. The revolutionary activity was that of the non-Jewish elements united with the Romanizing Jews:

In the realm of theory there was a conspicuous discrepancy between the Jewish belief in the Divine choice of the Jewish nation and in its glorious future on the one hand and on the other the present reality of the Roman Empire's omnipotent rule. This discrepancy found vent in increasing messianic hopes and in expectations that the eternal kingdom of the Jewish nation would be established. The contrast was sharpened by the very essence and character of the Roman Empire with its tyrannical rule and its idolatry which extended even to political manifestations such as emperor worship.

In addition to these feelings there were also several tangible features of the Roman regime which gravely offended the Jews. The presence of a Roman army in Jerusalem, the supervision by the authorities of Divine worship in the Temple, the heavy burden of taxes and customs duties—these, but perhaps most of all the Roman administration's support of the non-Jewish population in Eretz Israel, made the rule of Rome hated by the Jews.²

If Eretz Israel had continued to survive under these circumstances, it would have lost its identity as a Jewish state within a few years. Gaul, Romanized, became France. Hispania, Romanized, became Spain. Dacia, Romanized, became Rumania. If Eretz Israel had not succumbed to Roman arms, it would have fallen to Roman culture as a result of the non-Jewish population and the then-equivalent of today's culturally suicidal Jewish Left.

As noted previously, not only was there a large in-migration of non-Jews into Eretz Israel, a large and powerful Jewish community existed in Parthia (Persia). The Persian Jews supported their brethren in Eretz Israel. Ill-timing, however, interfered with the

likelihood of Parthian support because Parthia and Rome had just concluded one of their frequent (but short-lived) peace treaties.³

In August AD 66, Eleazar, captain of the Temple and second to the high priest, proclaimed that no more Temple sacrifices would be accepted from any foreigner. Since Rome was sponsoring twice-daily sacrifices for itself and the emperor, this was taken as a proclamation of war against Rome. Violence between Greek and Jew broke out all over Egypt, North Africa, and Palestine, with massacres perpetrated by both sides.⁴ By this time, the Roman governor of Syria knew that the situation was serious and marched toward Jerusalem, but was routed before he could get there, at Beth-horen, with the loss of 6,000 soldiers, the equivalent of one legion. After this loss, Nero sent a man of high rank, Vespasian, who was a senator and former consul. Vespasian collected 65,000 men with whom to besiege Jerusalem and then left his son Titus with the task of reducing Jerusalem. Vespasian himself had gone to Rome because Nero had been assassinated and Vespasian had imperial ambitions. In Rome, as in many places, power and danger went together. Vespasian kept himself out of the initial jockeying, and only when the other serious (and dangerous) claimants had assassinated each other, did he make his successful move.

The result was inevitable. In AD 70, Jerusalem was taken, and the Second Temple destroyed. Not only was Jerusalem destroyed, but damage to the land was enormous. This was the result not only of Roman depredations, but also because the Jews themselves had carried out a scorched-earth policy. The Romans allowed pagan immigrants to settle in the place of the massacred Jews.

We do not have census figures for the time around the fall of the Second Temple. We do know that although there were few Jews remaining in the areas around Jerusalem, that the area in the Galilee had a large Jewish population.⁵ The question of population becomes important because there was a subsequent, and final, effort on the part of the Jews to free themselves from pagan domination. “The war of Bar Kokhba lasted three years and strained the military resources of the empire to the utmost.”⁶

A very good summary of this last war and its sequellae are given in the Encyclopedia Judaica:

When it [the war of Bar Kokhba] ended after the capture of Betar near Jerusalem and the destruction of the last rebels in the caves of the Judean desert, the Jewish population of Judea was either dead, enslaved, or in flight. The whole area round Jerusalem was settled with non-Jews. Only Galilee remained a bastion of Judaism in Eretz Israel. In order to strike at the root of Jewish resistance, Hadrian prohibited the practice of the Jewish religion—an order which was for some time strictly enforced in Galilee but which seems to have remained a dead letter elsewhere. In other ways the disasters of the Bar Kokhba War strengthened Judaism in the Diaspora. First there were the fugitives who crammed all the ports of the Mediterranean, then the slaves, of which such masses were sold that the prices in the Roman slave markets fell. Among those going into the Diaspora were many scholars...The communities of Asia Minor were now the most prosperous, as is witnessed by their synagogues, of which that of Sardis was the most splendid...Rome, with the cities in its vicinity, now received many more of the Jewish refugees, and there

was a marked movement of the Diaspora westward into Gaul, Spain, and up the Rhine [Italics by author].

The two keys here are the dispersion of Jews into the Roman dependencies of Gaul, Spain, and Germania. These were the embryos that would become Western Europe. The second key point here is the dispersion of the scholars, who would be the creators of a new Temple, one that would be made of parchment and ink, a culture centered not on place, but on sacred writings. These writings would have the advantage of portability. And although made of parchment and ink, because of their easy reproducibility, they would prove to be far more substantial than a single sacred building of stone. And equally, if not more important, they would prove to be in a mode of constant evolution over centuries, as if they were an actual living organism. This unique phenomenon in world history forms the subject of part II of our story.

1 Encyclopedia Judaica, 1st ed., "History," 641.

2 Ibid.

3 Michael Grant, *The History of Ancient Israel* (New York: Scribner and Sons, 1984), 240.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid., 246.

6 Encyclopedia Judaica, 1st ed., sv "History," 646.

Introduction to Part II

The Bridge

The Purpose of Part II, "The Bridge," is to relate the history of the Jews from the end of ancient times to the beginning of the modern. As was true in the case of part I, the history of the Jews cannot be considered in vacuo, that is without due reference to the communities in which Jews were a presence, willingly or unwillingly on their part; welcome or unwelcome on the part of the host community. In later ancient times, following the fall of the First Temple, we had the dual identity of being part of a nation with a physical location (as there remained Jews in Palestine), as well as a minority community within larger communities. During the period under discussion in Part II, there is no national Jewish state.

The time period considered here will be from the final defeat of the forces of Bar Kokhba (ca. 135 AD) to the beginnings of the various Enlightenments (ca. 1517 AD), and the events immediately following.

The events that will form the bulk of this section will be discussions of Jewish Law. In order to put this in perspective, the reader will have to understand that the usual presumption of "law" in Western studies deals with temporal rather than religious law. That will not be the case here, during the evolution of rabbinic Judaism. The Gentile communities will not concern themselves with the internal legal code of the Jewish minority. It will not be until after the Enlightenment and the establishment of modern

nation-states that the distinction between civil and religious law engage the Jewish communities of Europe.

In the gentile communities this distinction was drawn much earlier, because of the enormous power and wealth that was in play between Church and State.

One of the weapons used by the Church in this struggle with the State was a document presumed to date back to the time of the Roman Emperor Constantine. For reasons of personal preference, and reasons of state, Constantine bestowed imperial favor on Christianity in 313 AD. Pope Silvester (314-335) was in office during the reign of Constantine, and, by legend, the Pope converted Constantine to Christianity. In gratitude to the Pope, Constantine is supposed to have given the Papacy temporal supremacy over Western Europe in a document called the Donation of Constantine:

-the supposed grant by the emperor Constantine, in gratitude for his conversion by Pope Silvester, to that pope and to his successors forever, not only of spiritual supremacy over the other great patriarchates and over all matters of faith and worship, but also of temporal dominion over Rome, Italy and “the provinces, places and civitates of the western regions...” It is now universally admitted to be a gross forgery... however, it is certain that the constitutum was regarded as genuine both by the friends and enemies of the papal pretensions throughout the middle ages.¹

The operative words here are that it was regarded as genuine by both sides. What is real and what is believed to be real have equal force as motivators of human behavior.

The struggle between the Papacy and temporal states would form a large part of medieval European history, involving diplomacy, the use of setting of one state against another, and even war. Today, the only remnant of the temporal power of the Papacy is Vatican City in Rome.

This struggle between temporal and spiritual authorities could not have occurred in the Jewish Diaspora community, as there was no Jewish state. There was insufficient wealth and power to lead to war. Hence the rabbinic rulings encompassed both the religious issues and matters of civil law that arose in the Jewish communities. In general, the medieval gentile communities restricted this authority to non-capital cases. The authority to fine and imprison were generally permitted to the local Jewish authorities.

However, prior to discussing the Law, I will give a brief history of the spread of Jews through Western Europe. This will include the discriminations, pogroms, and expulsions that precipitated the migration of the bulk of the Jewish community from Western Europe to Eastern Europe.

¹ Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th ed. sv “Donation of Constantine”.

CHAPTER 12

THE WESTERN MIGRATION: ASHKENAZI JEWS

In chapter 5 we discussed the origin of Holy Script. These texts were redacted by scholars who were descendents of the Jewish refugees who fled to Babylon, that is, to the East. There was, after the fall of the Second Temple in AD 70, and after the defeat of Bar Kokhba in AD 135, a massive exodus from Eretz Israel due to forced migration, sale into slavery, and the hostility of the Greek population that had been transplanted by Rome

into Eretz Israel. Many of these Jewish migrants went first to Rome, and then spread to the provinces, that is, to the West:

The first Jews to reach Germany were merchants who went there in the wake of the Roman legions and settled in the Roman-founded Rhine towns [see map V]. The earliest detailed record of a Jewish community in Germany, referring to Cologne, is found in imperial decrees issued in 321 and 331 AD.¹

Regarding France (or Gaul, in the terminology of the time):

A story taken as legend (intended to explain the origin of the prayer *Hu Rahum*) states that after the conquest of Jerusalem, the Romans filled three ships with Jewish captives, which arrived in Bordeaux, Arles, and Lyons. Recent archeological findings tend to find a basis for this legend. Objects identified as Jewish because of the menorah portrayed on them have been discovered around Arles (first, fourth, and early fifth centuries). Written sources, previously treated with some reserve, affirm that during the Roman period Jews had been present in Metz (mid fourth century), Poitiers (late fourth century), Avignon (late fourth century), and Arles (mid fifth century).²

In Spain, there is evidence that Jews were settled in Roman Spain by the third century AD.³

A useful distinction to bear in mind is that the Jews and their descendents, who settled in France, Germany, and Italy, referred to themselves as “Ashkenazim.” This term will refer not only to those above, but also to those who subsequently migrated from these places to what would later be called Eastern Europe, states such as Poland, Lithuania, and Russia. By contrast, those Jews who fled Eretz Israel and arrived in Egypt, North Africa, Arabia, and Spain, referred to themselves as “Sephardim.” I emphasize these terms because they will recur and have meaning up to the present time.

There seems to have been little conflict between the Jewish communities and their neighbors during the earlier centuries of Roman rule. There appears to have been no forced segregation and no special laws enforced against Jews as a community. This era of tolerance is probably a result of the pre-Christian nature of the natives, because, having a plurality of religions, they would have less reason to view Jews as different. However, records from these times are sparse, and there may have been conflicts of which we are not aware. However, with the advent of Christianity, changes would occur.

As early as AD 339, Roman Emperor Constantinius II prohibited marriage between Jews and Christians. This was not, in itself, a great disability to Jews, because it was consistent with rabbinical decrees. However, the same edict forbade Jews to possess Christian slaves.

This last prohibition went far to undermine the economic structure of the Jewish community in agriculture in particular. At this period it was inconceivable to maintain any fair-sized agricultural unit without employing slaves, who were becoming rapidly Christianized.⁴

(The reader will recall that by the late Roman Republic, yeoman farming disappeared throughout the Imperium.)

A further decree was issued by Emperor Theodosius II on Jan. 31, AD 438 in order to ensure that Jews might not obtain administrative power over Christians in state functions and offices:

We believe it is wrong that the enemies of the heavenly Majesty and of the Roman laws should become the executors of our laws, and that they, fortified by the authority of the acquired rank, should have power to judge or sentence Christians...as if they insult our faith...For the same reason we prohibit that any synagogue should arise as a new building.⁵

In reading these disabling decrees, it is important to realize the era in which they were written. There were similar decrees written by the Jewish authorities (in Mishnah and Gemara*) against the rights of non-Jews living in a Jewish state.

Life in the Daughter States of the Roman Empire

The official end of the Roman Empire (in the West) occurred in AD 476. Obviously, the decline was protracted over centuries. It is beyond the scope of this book to relate this history. But we will be concerned with the cultural influence that survived the empire because its residua are very much a part of the development of the culture of Europe and the North and South America. The most obvious and important residuum of the empire is the Roman Catholic Church.

Several centuries after the fall of the Roman Empire, Muslim forces sweeping out of the Arabian peninsula from the 7th through the 11th centuries created a vast empire that included all of Egypt, North Africa, most of Palestine, eastern Turkey, Persia, and much of Spain. As a result, 90 percent of the world's Jews were under Muslim rule. In general, during the medieval period, Muslim rule was relatively benevolent toward Jews, especially when contrasted to that of the successor states of the Roman Empire. These were the Jews referred to as Sephardim. However, for our purposes, we will emphasize the Ashkenazim, or European Jewry.

The story of the 10 percent of world Jewry (Ashkenazim) requires a brief look at the Roman Catholic Church. As a rule, the upper ranks of the Church were relatively better disposed to Jews than the parish priests or the monastic and mendicant orders. This reflects the general principle that, with some drastically tragic exceptions, European Jews fared better among the ruling elite than among the common people (including the lower clergy).⁶

Early Christian Spain

Due to the collapse (and in part a cause of the collapse) of the empire, Germanic tribes took over large parts of North Africa (prior to the Muslim conquest) and much of Spain. The German tribes who took over Spain were called the Visigoths:

Seventh-century Visigothic Spain waged a continuous struggle against Jewish existence. A series of laws was promulgated throughout the century to punish Jews for adhering to their faith...and to take away their children from them in order to educate them in true Christian homes.⁷

Regardless of the rulership of Spain, from Roman times, at least until the late twentieth century, Spain has never been noted as favorable to trade, banking, and manufacturing.

Early Christian France

In the west, north of Italy, the withdrawal of Roman legions from the areas north of the Rhine River (see map V) led to a power vacuum. Germanic tribes, called in the aggregate Franks, established themselves along the right and left banks of the Rhine during the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th century. One subdivision of these Frankish tribes was referred to as the Ripuarian franks. Their importance lies in the fact that where they settled, on both sides of the Rhine, the Roman language and civilization was replaced with Germanic culture.⁸ This remains true to today. I will discuss in future chapters the split, initiated by Martin Luther in 1517, between Catholic and Protestant confessions that also will follow this cultural divide, with Catholic France to the west, and Lutheran Germany to the east. However, that is yet to come. By “France” I refer here to the empire of Charlemagne, which included most of what is today France, Germany, and Italy.

It is interesting to note once again the role played by geography in the settlements of the Franks along the Rhine River. Again nature provides well-watered croplands and ease of transport and communication (map V). As noted, Jewish settlers followed the legions along the Rhine. The advent of Charlemagne’s empire had a positive effect on Jewish settlement:

In the Carolingian Empire of the eighth and ninth centuries, trade and mercantile connections were at a much higher premium than in the declining Visigothic kingdom [Spain]; hence the treatment of Jews was much better, though always within the framework of the general attitude set by the Church. Emperor Louis the Pious and his advisors were in particular favorably disposed to Jewish trade, and under him court society treated Jews well.⁹

During the years leading up to the 10th and 11th centuries, the Christianization of the European peasantry proceeded, until there were very few (and probably no self-confessed) pagans left in Western Europe. Jews were becoming regarded with mixed feelings: they were necessary for trade, which enriched the rulers through tax revenues and made goods available to the peasantry, but proselytizing Christianity carried with it hatred against Jews as “killers of Christ” and also the stigma of being “other” in a culture newly unified under a single religion. In a sense, paganism worked to the advantage of the Jews, because Jews were not uniquely “other” in the presence of many pagan cults. Here we see the disadvantage of “particularism” as it relates to Jews, and we will see such repeated episodes of being singled out for persecution, over the ensuing centuries. But we will also see, in the 19th century, a Jewish response to “particularism” that will be wholly new, with tragic consequences to the entire world.

The Church itself was not of one mind regarding the Jews, and this ambiguity figured into state policy and private feelings toward Jews in all of western Europe:

Christian society continued to develop, under the guidance of the Church, its pernicious hatred of the Jews. Though the upper ranks of the Church hierarchy accepted, both in theory and in practice, the relatively “mild” attitude toward the Jews of Augustine and Gregory I, the lower ranks tended to be more consistent than their superiors and inclined to question in their sermons the compromise implicit in the Jewish denial of Christianity under Christian rule, thus veering toward the attitude suggested by the legislation of Justinian and Reccared I. Various factors—both general and relating in particular to

Jews—helped to shape attitudes towards the Jews in various Christian countries in various times and circumstances. The unifying and directing overall Christian influence was the divided attitude displayed by the Church—less hostile at the top, and increasingly hostile downward. Royalty, the nobility, and the townspeople added elements colored by their own interests to the prevailing temper, but always merging with one or other of the two aspects of the Church attitude.¹⁰

As we will see, the phenomenon of acceptance of Jews by the upper classes, and the hostility toward them by the lower classes will be a theme running through the entire history of the Jewish people, whether we speak of clergy, or any other section of society that is, within itself, layered by class. This distinction will be seen to hold in general, but not in all instances.

1 Encyclopedia Judaica, 1st ed., 1971. sv “Germany.”

2 Ibid., sv “France.”

3 Ibid., sv “Spain.”

4 Ibid., sv “History,” 653.

5 Ibid., sv “History,” 654.

6 Ibid., sv “History,” 661.

7 Ibid., sv “History,” 661–662.

8 Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th ed. sv “Franks.”

9 Encyclopedia Judaica, 1st ed. 1971. sv “History,” 663.

10 Ibid., 661.

*Defined in chapter 5.

CHAPTER 13

TIME OF CRUSADES AND PLAGUE

This discussion of the Crusades will explore their effect on the Jews of western Europe. A study of their global effects is beyond the scope of this book.

As noted in part I chapter 10, by AD 700 the Muslim conquest of Palestine, Persia, and Mesopotamia was militarily complete. Obviously, the Muslim conquerors comprised the ruling class. At this time and place, it was not Muslim practice to convert by force. Initially, Muslims formed the minority. In Palestine, the bulk of the population was Christian, as was that of most of Syria, Egypt, and North Africa. The Muslim overlords exerted subtle pressure to gain converts. Anyone wishing to advance in government almost always had to be Muslim. Most professions were limited to Muslims. There were special taxes that non-Muslims had to pay and a subordinate legal status to endure. Those tolerated non-Muslims (Christians and Jews) had a form of second-class citizenship, or “dhimmitude.” The conditions of dhimmitude could be so mild as to be almost nonexistent or could be so harsh as to make living a normal life almost impossible. It all depended on the will of the ruler.

Over time, the subtle but constant pressure of dhimmitude led to the conversion of most of the common people, first the city dwellers, and later the peasantry. By the end of the eighth century, this process had produced an overwhelming Muslim majority in the Middle East. The ruler of this empire, a vast area whose only commonality was the Muslim religion, was the Caliph. The Caliph was considered to be the successor to Mohammad, and “the shadow of God on earth,” who ruled from Baghdad. Some of the rulers, especially the Abbasid Caliph Harun al Rashid (AD 766–809), presided over particularly wealthy and open societies, in which religious distinctions made minimal difference, and cultural and literary openness flourished.

Rather than academically describing the cultural life of this rich period, I will introduce some quotes from the Arabian Nights, written before the Crusades. They will show a civilization of great affluence, and one which respects trade. We will also see the liberal use of wine and apparent acceptance of homosexuality. We will see that trade is an honorable profession, unlike in Europe.

First, the description of the house of Sindbad the Sailor:

He saw a wonderful house, filled with grave and noble people, and, when he was led into the great central hall, came upon an honorable company of well-born guests. There were flowers of all kinds, perfumes of every sweetness, great selection of dry conserves, sweetmeats, almond paste, and rare fruits; there were innumerable dishes loaded with roast lambs and other delicate meat, and jars past counting full of wine from a chosen grape. There were fair slaves ranged in due order, bending over lutes.¹

Regarding trade:

We set sail the same day and made excellent time across the sea, visiting from island to island, and ocean to ocean, for many weeks, making ourselves known to the notables and chief merchants at each port of call, and both selling and exchanging our goods to great advantage.²

Proceeding further in the Arabian Nights, we find mention of male homosexuality in a manner varying from outright to grudging acceptance. In several passages, the discussion is cast in a debate between characters as to whether making love to young girls or young boys is more pleasurable. One such passage is cited below:

Surely you will admit that a woman has nothing which can compare with the beauty of a youth, his supple waist, his fine-drawn limbs, the tender mingling of color in his cheeks, his gentle smile and charm of his voice? The Prophet himself, in putting us on our guard against so evident a danger, said: “do not look upon beardless boys, for their eyes hold more temptation than the eyes of huris...”

When you compare boys with girls, you simply flatter your corrupt desire. We know your boy-loving poets well! The greatest of them all, Abu Nuwas, the king of pederasts.³

The passages above are consistent with the tolerant attitude of Muslim society to Christians and Jews. It also shows an openness to cultural variance that was less common in Christian Europe. It is then of no surprise that Jews flourished in this culture.

Despite the Muslim takeover of the Holy Land, Christian access to the Holy Places at first remained unrestricted. In fact, in 807 Harun al Rashid “acknowledged Charlemagne

as protector of Jerusalem and owner of the Church of the Sepulcher. Charlemagne founded a hospital and a library in the Holy City.”⁴

However, expressions of religious sentiment tend to fluctuate from tolerance to claims of exclusivity. It was only a matter of time until the inevitable turn of the wheel:

In the 11th century interruptions [in Muslim-Christian mutual toleration] began to come. The fanaticism of the caliph Hakim destroyed the church of the Sepulchre and ended the Frankish protectorate (1010); [it was not only a question of Muslim intolerance] and the patronage of the Holy Places, a source of strife between the Greek and Latin Churches...passed to the Byzantine empire in 1021. This latter change in itself made pilgrimages from the west increasingly difficult: the Byzantines, especially after the schism of 1054, did not seek to smooth the way of the pilgrim.⁵

The response of Christians in western Europe to this loss, real and imagined (few in western Europe could afford the time and money necessary for the pilgrimage, so the real impact on the average person was nil), was deep and emotional. Prior to the First Crusade, widespread massacre of Jews was rare in the west. No longer. The year is 1096.

The First crusade falls naturally into two parts. One of these may be called the Crusade of the people; the other the Crusade of the princes. Of these the people’s crusade—prior in order of time; if only secondary in point of importance—may naturally be studied first. The sermon of [Pope] Urban II at Clermont became the staple for wondering preachers, among whom Peter the Hermit distinguished himself by his fiery zeal. Riding on an ass from place to place through France and along the Rhine, he carried away by his eloquence thousands of the poor. Some three or four months before the term fixed by Urban II, in April and May 1096, five divisions of paupers had already collected. Three of these, led by Gottschalk, and William the carpenter respectively, failed to reach even Constantinople. The armies of Fulcher and Gottschalk were destroyed by the Hungarians in just revenge for their excesses (June), the third, after joining in a wild Judenhetze in the towns of the valley of the Rhine, during which some 10,000 Jews perished as the first fruits of crusading zeal, was scattered to the winds in Hungary.⁶

The princes’ crusade was much more successful: On July 15, 1099, they captured Jerusalem and slaughtered all the Jews and Muslims they could find:

After a little more than a month’s siege, the city was finally captured...The slaughter was terrible; the blood of the conquered ran down the streets, until men splashed in blood as they rode. At nightfall, “sobbing from excess of joy,” the crusaders came to the Sepulchre from their treading of the winepress, and put their blood-stained hands together in prayer.⁷

Other than that “incidental” massacre, there does not appear to have been any concerted attempt on the part of the princes to single out Jews in Europe. This may be because the motivation of the princes was different from that of the people. “We have already seen that among the princes who joined the First Crusade there were some who were rather politiques than dévots, and who aimed at the acquisition of temporal profits as well as spiritual merit.”⁸

One aspect of the massacres relating to the Crusades in general is that in many instances the Jews were offered the opportunity of conversion or death. In most instances, they

chose death, first killing their children, and then dying themselves, either in last-ditch fighting or by suicide. Martyrdom in these circumstances was sanctioned under rabbinic law as an act of Kiddush ha-Shem, or honoring God's name. The Second Crusade (1146–7) and the Third Crusade (1189–90) produced similar massacres, motivated as much by greed for plunder as by religious zeal. Again, the higher clergy discouraged mob action. In a letter to “the English People” and also sent to “the Archbishops, Bishops and all the clergy of eastern France and Bavaria,” Bernard of Clairvaux wrote:

The Jews are not to be persecuted, killed or even put to flight...The Jews are for us the living words of Scripture, for they remind us always of what our Lord suffered. They are dispersed over all the world so that by expiating their crime they may be everywhere the living witness of our redemption...Under Christian princes they endure a hard captivity, but “they only wait for the time of their deliverance.”⁹

With the passage of the crusades, two new threats to the Jews appeared in the form of the blood libel and the desecration of the Host. The first was the belief that Jews killed Christian children to obtain their blood for Passover matzos, and the second was that Jews desecrated the consecrated communion wafer. Those who held these beliefs were the generally poor and/or rural. Life could get so insecure for Jews that they “protected themselves by leaving the towns and moving to castles of the nobility—paying money for the Christians to leave the castle so as to defend it themselves.”¹⁰ As unbelievable as it would seem, there were still more than a few benighted souls who still believed in things like the blood libel and desecration of the Host at the beginning of the twentieth century.

An enormous disaster was about to strike Europe. A ship from the Crimea slipped into a Genoese harbor in 1347, barely able to sail because so many of the crew had died of a mysterious ailment. A few similar ships grounded themselves on the Italian coast with no living crew. These ships were promptly looted. Thus was the Black Death introduced to Europe. In the ensuing epidemic, it is estimated that one-quarter of the population of Europe died.¹¹ There was no understanding at the time of bacteria and the role played by rats and lice in transmitting disease, so it was natural for theories of every sort to be believed. One of the most common theories was that Jews were poisoning the wells of Christians. Although this theory may sound preposterous, there is evidence that in the United States today many Blacks think that the AIDS epidemic is a government plot against them. Stupidity knows no boundary of time or race. Recurrent episodes of plague continued to occur in Europe until about 1665–6.

Prior to the advent of the Black Death, medieval art had pictured the Jews as killers of Christ and minions of Satan. Thus it was not at all difficult for the well-poisoning theory to gain wide-spread credence. Many Jewish communities were destroyed, rebuilt, and destroyed again. There were enormous massacres. But these massacres had an element missing in those of the Crusades: Jews were not given the option of conversion. Those who could not flee, died.

By the end of the 15th century, Christian forces were on the verge of defeating the last Muslim strongholds in Spain. After the amalgamation of Aragon and Castile, the Spanish rulers expelled all non-Catholics from Spain; Portugal soon followed suit. Many Jews went to the Netherlands where a policy of religious toleration had been developing since the Reformation. Such toleration existed nowhere else in Europe at this time. Outside of

the Netherlands, it was the era of *cuis regio, eius religio* (as the ruler believes so must the people).

Thus with the exception of Holland, by 1500, there were practically no Jews along the Rhine basin, ending a presence that had been there since the late Roman Empire. The migration to Poland and Lithuania (see map V), which had been slowly proceeding, made those areas the principle center of European Judaism.

Prior to exploring Jewish culture as it developed in Eastern Europe, one aspect of the Western Jewish experience needs attention. This is the evolution of the role of Court Jew. To the extent that Jews were literate, they were competent to do administrative work and collect taxes. To the extent that they were money lenders, they were a source of capital, either borrowed or extorted. These functions were important to princes. The term Court Jew in German is *Hoffjude*. Another term is *Hoffaktor*, although *Hoffaktor* may relate specifically to banking. I quote below a passage from the Jewish Encyclopedia that sums up this relationship between prince and Jew. The term used in the article is *Serf of the Chamber*:

The legal status of the Jews and their security remained unstable as the result of the First Crusade. The old system of granting charters and Imperial episcopal protection and defense was found totally wanting in the face of popular incitement and attack. The state, as well as the Jews, was searching for a new formula and new guarantees of safety...

Legendary influences, legal notions, and fiscal hopes of the chance to exact maximum extortion in taxes and contributions from Jews merged with old imperial conceptions of the duty to give protection and the safeguarding of ordered life to embrace all the inhabitants of the realm. From early formulations that the Jews “belong to our chamber” (*attineant ad cameram nostrum*, Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, in 1182), through the final legal conception of Emperor Frederick II expressed in 1237, that “the imperial authority has from ancient times condemned the Jews to eternal servitude for their sins” in his charter granted to the city of Vienna, there arrived the term given currency by the same emperor that the Jews were “*servi camerae nostrae, sub imperiale protectione*” [*serfs of our chamber, under imperial protection*]. King Henry III of England formulated... “That no Jew remain in England unless he do the King Service, and that from the hour of birth every Jew, whether male or female, serve Us in some way.” This legal conception served in many cases as a license for the capricious extortion of money from Jews....

“The servitude of Jews” did not always work to their detriment. Considered as a Royal chattel, they usually enjoyed royal protection...

Jews in the Middle Ages often expressed their attitude to the legal and political framework in which they were living in their discussions of the conception that “the law of the government is the law” (*dina de-malkhuta dina*), as applying to Jews. Their deliberations on these themes show their estimate of and preference for differing political systems and legal structures. On the whole they are shown to be pro-royalist and against disruptive forces. They are for “the old, the customary and hallowed law,” and against arbitrary innovation [all italics for emphasis mine]. 12

Present here is an implied contract that in return for safety, the Jews will support the central state against all popular forces that may arise. It just so happened that “popular forces” would include peasants, rural folk, and the lower clergy: —the very repositories of Jew-hatred. We will see in modern times the consequences of this slavish behavior; it will be seen to be completely consistent with the support of the Communist dictatorships of the twentieth century. Jews of the medieval period feared liberty as much as the Jewish Left of today. The continuance of their sycophantic behavior is as commonplace as it is inappropriate to the changed time and circumstance.

1 *The Thousand and One Nights*. Trans. by Mardrus and Mathers. Vol. II. (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), 177.

2 *Ibid.*, 187.

3 *Ibid.*, 411.

4 *Encyclopedia Britannica*. 11th ed. sv “Crusades.”

5 *Ibid.*

6 *Ibid.*

7 *Ibid.*

8 *Ibid.*

9 *Encyclopedia Judaica*. 1971. 1st ed., sv “History,” 668.

10 *Ibid.*, 669.

11 *Encyclopedia Britannica*. 11th ed. sv “Plague.”

12 *Encyclopedia Judaica*. 1971. 1st ed., “History,” 677.

CHAPTER 14

TWO MORE HOLY BOOKS

The Midrash

At this point, we must consider two additional works that were added to the canon. As is usually the case, these works were produced to meet current needs.

The first one is called the Midrash. The word in Hebrew, a noun, means “a searching out.” In Hebrew, the plural of one class of nouns is formed by adding *im* to the stem of the noun. So the plural of a midrash is midrashim. The Midrash is a series of books relating parables, folk wisdom, and comments on biblical texts. The term Midrash (capitalized) refers to the totality of the written works, and a midrash (lowercase) is a single parable or tale. The Bible is, in many cases, sparse in its exploration of human motivation. After relating events in a terse fashion, it frequently passes on to something else. The Midrash serves to fill out the more subjective aspects of the events, in order to make them more meaningful to the reader. It was redacted between AD 400 and AD 1200, although the stories and explanations given are much older. Some of the parables and fables are common to other cultures, such as Greece or Persia. Below is a parable that attempts to fill out a very laconic Biblical text:

Look at the biblical story of Cain and Abel, for example. Halfway into the narrative we read the following verse: “Cain said to Abel, his brother. And it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against his brother Abel and slew him.” (Gen. 4.8)...Something is wrong here... the dialogue never appears!

But for the Midrash this problem is not a difficulty; it is an opportunity. Midrash supplies the missing dialogue. We hear the cause of the enmity between Cain and Abel and the confusion is solved. Thus according to one source, the story of Cain and Abel is one of petty and foolish jealousy—on both sides. And because of that murder entered human experience.¹

This Midrash then becomes almost existentially plaintive:

Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai said “This is a difficult thing to say and it is impossible to say it clearly. Once two athletes were wrestling before the king. If the king wants, they can be separated; but he did not want them separated. One overcame the other and killed him. The loser cried out as he died: ‘Who will get justice for me from the king?’ Thus: ‘The voice of your brother’s blood is crying out to me from the land.’ ”²

This passage is so poignant and so universal that any reader feels a painful tug at the heart by this parable. Barry Holtz, who cited the passage above, notes that it refers to the story of Cain and Abel. Mr. Holtz also notes the trepidation felt by Rabbi Shimon in daring to hold God accountable for evil:

“This is a difficult thing to say and it is impossible to say it clearly.”

Mr. Holtz ends this midrash by concluding:

Certainly the parable is obvious—God is the king; the two wrestlers are Cain and Abel. The wrestler cries out with great anguish—“Who will get justice for me from before the king?” Why? Because he realizes that it is the king who must be blamed. Had the king wanted to stop the fight he could have. Does the text mean to say: Had God wished to prevent the murder [of Abel] He could have? What Shimon ben Yochai is suggesting is that God is to blame for this murder—He is the true culprit.³

However, the Midrash, as a collection, is very large, perhaps twenty-two volumes. So this question, as many others, is revisited. This time, it is revisited from another angle, that of the perpetrator himself trying to justify his act by serpentlike logic. In this midrash, Cain represents the universal culprit. He makes three universal excuses in a dialogue with God. The first:

The whole situation, he argues, is very much like something else—a thief who steals from under the nose of the night watchman. Clearly, it is the watchman who is to blame—the thief was only doing his job.⁴

This defense is not as outrageous as it appears. There was a case in a state court in which a thief trying to rob a school fell through the roof of the school building and successfully sued the school district. Cain acted as a good liberal should.

The second:

God, according to Cain, created the inclination in man to do evil and therefore, in at least an ultimate way, He is to be blamed.⁵

If there is a patron saint for ambulance-chasing lawyers, it should be Cain.

The third:

Why does God accept Abel's sacrifice in Genesis 4.4, but reject Cain's? Is not God the true culprit in the tale by this act of favoritism?

The world as we know it is unfair. The problem is that attempts to make everything fair lead to enforced egalitarianism. Thus we enthrone mediocrity.

Mr. Holtz points out that God's response to these complaints is the simple rebuke "[The] voice of your brother's blood calls out to me."

We can see that complex moral issues are explored at length and from every point of view in the Midrash. If the reader has a few spare hours, he would be well-rewarded by reading randomly from the Midrash on the Internet or in the reference room of a major public library.

The Midrash, as noted, is later than the Old Testament...The Five Books of Moses, the Pentateuch, does not concern itself with eschatology. But by the time of the Second Temple, if not earlier, questions of the immortality of the soul and life after death had become a central concern of Jews, as it had to Greeks, Persians, and Egyptians. The entire Mediterranean world was almost obsessed with these questions. Whether these issues were raised from within Judaism or were adopted from the outside world, they had to be addressed. Thus the Midrash assumes the existence of the soul and life after death.⁶ However, the importance of eschatology in Judaism has almost always been less emphasized as compared to Christianity and Islam.

Kabbalah

Most, if not all, of the world's major religions have a set of beliefs which is called dogma. In some religions, such as Catholicism, the dogma is extensive. In others, such as Unitarianism, it is minimal. All major religions also have a mystical aspect to them, which is usually of concern only to a small minority of the practitioners of the given religion. Most people seem to be satisfied with the more prosaic form of their religion. Judaism, too, has a mystical tradition.

As noted above, the Midrash was codified by the end of the thirteenth century. But religious needs did not stop evolving. Almost as if to continue to provide a medium of expression, a series of writings known as Kabbalah evolved. The term Kabbalah in Hebrew means "that which has been received." What has been received, alluded to here, is divine truth, as given by God to Moses at Mt. Sinai and transmitted by him to the select among Israel. Thus, although Kabbalah is acknowledged in the thirteenth century, tradition relates that it had been present since the revelation on Mt. Sinai. A definition of mysticism (and thus Kabbalah) by Joseph Dan is as good a definition as we can find:

While religion is an expression of faith in the words of scripture and revelation, mystics tend to claim that truth lies beyond any possibility of expression by terms derived from sensual experience or logical deduction.⁷

As Kabbalah is an enormous subject, I can only touch upon it. It should be noted that the Kabbalah is not a specific book; the term Kabbalah refers to a series of books. The three principle books comprising the Kabbalah are the Sefer Yetzirah, redacted between AD

300–400, the Bahir, first published around AD 1176,8 and the Zohar, published around AD 1305.9 A principle idea, if not the principle idea, is that God can be described as a series of ten emanations. These emanations are each called Sefirah (plural Sefirot). (See figure 1, pg 104.) The English word sapphire derives from this term. The highest Sefirah is called Ein Sof, Hebrew for without end. As we go from the higher to lower levels of Sefirot, we progress from what is completely inaccessible to human experience to what is more accessible:

I will quote Lawrence Fine's definition of Ein-Sof:

It is that aspect of God which is utterly unknowable and unreachable sealed beyond all human apprehension. The hidden and perfect root of all reality, Ein Sof can be neither positively named nor imagined. At most it can be described as "that which thought cannot attain," "the concealed light," or as "indistinguishable unity." Frequently, it is called "the root of all roots" or the "cause of all causes." Ein-Sof, then, constitutes the dimension of the divine life that is absolutely transcendent, God as he is known only to Himself. The limitations of human cognition make it impossible for people to contemplate Ein-Sof. According to some kabbalists in fact, even Scripture makes no reference to God in his capacity as Ein-Sof.¹⁰

Mr. Fine continues his description, which now becomes anthropomorphic (note: there are other descriptions which are not anthropomorphic). As we descend, the next level contains two Sefirot; Wisdom on the right side, and Understanding on the left. These paired forces must be in balance for the universe to be in balance. They pour Wisdom and understanding to the Sefirah in the middle, called Beauty. Beauty is the male symbol, or phallus. By way of another Sefirah, Beauty fills the lowest Sefirah, the female symbol. In Hebrew this lowest emanation is called Shekhinah and is the point at which God and Man most directly interact. When all is well with the universe, the Shekhinah is close to man. When the world lacks holiness, the Shekhinah draws away from the world. During the time of the First Temple, it was thought to be God's abode on earth, and was believed to be located just above the Ark of the Covenant. Humans can bring the Shekhinah closer by practicing piety, charity, and fulfilling as much as humanly possible all the commands of Torah. This activity is called Tikkun Ha Olam, (repairing the world).

We will see in the twentieth century the perversion of Tikkun to advance secular Socialism. "Rabbi" Michael Lerner, a one-time advisor to Hillary Clinton, is a proponent of this heresy, and publishes a pro-Socialist magazine labeled Tikkun. This is an example of Hillul ha-Shem, dishonoring God's name by profane use of a sacred practice.

Kabbalah added some new ideas to Jewish tradition. One was the ability of man to affect God. According to this concept, God and Man are locked in a mutually dependent relationship, working together to perfect creation. Man is indispensable to God; He had to create Man. The most important of modern (ca. 1570) Kabbalists, Isaac Luria expressed this concept:

Isaac Luria dared, unlike most theologians and philosophers, to put in the center of his worldview the most basic questions, which are so often avoided: Why everything? Why does God exist? Why did the creation occur? What is [the] meaning of everything? He gave to these questions a most radical and revolutionary answer, expressed in daring mythological concepts and terms. The most innovative concept that lies at the heart of

Luria's teachings is the imperfection of beginning. Existence does not begin with a perfect Creator bringing into being an imperfect universe; rather, the existence of the universe is the result of an inherent flaw or crisis within the infinite Godhead, and the purpose of creation is to perfect it.¹¹

It is also important to note that the concept of the multilayered manifestations of the Godhead brought Judaism to a closer relationship with Christianity. This may be the principle reason that Kabbalah has attracted the interest of Christians for centuries.

The ancient idea of parallel universes of Good and Evil is also part of Kabbalah:

The formulation of the powers of evil as an independent enemy of the divine, and the description of human life as being conducted in a dualistic universe in which evil and good are in constant struggle, is the contribution of the Kabbalah to Jewish worldview... a brief written by rabbi Isaac ben Jacob ha-Cohen, entitled Treatise on the Emanations on the left (1265)... describes a parallel system of seven divine evil powers, the first of which is called Samael and the seventh, feminine one is called Lilith. While both of these figures have a long history in Jewish writings before Rabbi Isaac, it seems he was the first to bring them together as a divine couple, parallel to God and the Shekhinah, who rule over a diverse structure of evil demons, who struggle for domination in the universe against the powers of goodness, the emanations of the right.¹²

One key element that we cannot lose sight of here is that orthodox belief is that all the ideas that are searched out in texts redacted after the Pentateuch are already present in the original text, albeit in hidden form. The Torah is always considered complete. This expansion of meaning given to Torah explains how the text can be complete when it is on the surface seemingly only historical narrative and legalistic detail. In addition, the contention is that there is not even one superfluous word in the Pentateuch. Thus the Torah is complete in its exclusivity and its inclusivity.¹³

Regarding both Midrash and Kabbalah, we may draw some conclusions. The process of Midrash allows great scope of commentary on Biblical text, with only the most tenuous connection or even with no apparent connection at all to the actual text. Even greater scope is allowed in Kabbalah, as the very core of theological philosophy is unmoored from previous restrictions. It may have been the massacres and deportations that stimulated these arcane thoughts. But we must never forget that during all these excursions of the spirit and mind, obedience to the letter of the Law, Halacha, was strictly maintained.

It has been the maintenance of Halacha that accounts for the survival of Judaism for the last two thousand years.

1 Barry W. Holtz et al., eds. *Back to the Sources: Reading the Classic Jewish Texts* (New York: Summit Books, 1984), 180–181.

2 *Ibid.*, 194.

3 *Ibid.*, 196.

4 *Ibid.*, 196.

5 *Ibid.*, 196.

6 Ibid., 182–183.

7 Joseph Dan, *Kabbalah: A Very Short Introduction* (New York, Oxford University Press, 2006), 9.

8 Aryeh Kaplan, *The Bahir Illumination* (York Beach, Maine, Samuel Weiser, Inc., 1979), xvii.

9 Dan, *Kabbalah*, 30.

10 Holtz, *Back to the Sources*, 318.

11 Dan, *Kabbalah*, 73–74.

12 Ibid., 50.

13 Holtz, *Back to the Sources*, 202.

CHAPTER 15

ARISTOTLE'S INFLUENCE

Impact on Christianity

In Western Europe, by around 1100, just as the Crusades began, so did the University system. By that date, society was getting more complex, and it seems that the universal curse of complex societies is the perceived need for lawyers. Doctors were needed too, but given the state of medical science of the time, they were more like apprentices to the Angel of Death. The Church was catholic as well as Catholic, and needed capable administrators, as well as canon lawyers. The state needed civil servants. It always does. It doesn't take long for the reciprocal relationship: civil servants need the state. The problem was that most literate men were in monasteries. Since one couldn't get the monks out of the monastery, the solution was to take the learning from the monasteries, and establish seats of learning in the outside world.

Thus we have major universities founded: Paris, 1100; Bologna, 1088; Oxford, ca. 1100. The problem now was to find a knowledge source upon which to base the teaching. The Bible and the writings of the Church fathers were immediately accepted as part of the curriculum. But for natural science, medicine, logic, and philosophy, the only encyclopedic source of knowledge were the collected works of Aristotle. His work was lost to the West in the chaos following the fall of the Western Roman Empire, but was retrieved from Arab sources just before and during the Crusades. Today, when we are literally drowning in scientific and literary material, it is difficult to imagine a time when a book was a rare thing.

Aristotle, at his peak about 335 BC, produced a canon of knowledge in philosophy, natural science, logic, ethics, drama, and poetry that dominated the European University from the twelfth century until the sixteenth. From the twelfth century until today, no one man has had such an impact on Western civilization. The Arab world was also influenced, but to a lesser degree. To some degree, all three religions of the Book, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam were affected.

Christianity, during the High Middle Ages, produced a scholar who attempted to reconcile science with religion, Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274). Aquinas held, with

Aristotle, that philosophy and science (there was no difference at that time) could use reason to add to science and mathematics. From observing what is around us, we can inductively draw general conclusions, thus proceeding from the specific to the general. Religion, on the other hand, proceeds from the general (revelation) to explain the specific. Some of what is learned through revelation is not discoverable through reason, but what is discoverable through reason will not conflict with revelation, since both reason and revelation lead to truth. His major theological writing is the *Summa Theologica*, which is still used in Catholic education today.

The method of scholarship used in the medieval period is known as scholasticism. A few citations from the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* may define the methodology:

In the Latin west during the 12th and 13th centuries the goal of commentary was to explain the author's intention. However, until the end of the 13th century, the author was assumed to intend to express the truth; thus every effort was made to bring an author's text into harmony with the truth. This attitude toward texts is generally thought to emerge from the tradition of biblical exegesis, where the biblical text is assumed to be true, in accord with the basic articles of faith, and hence, as needing to be interpreted within those parameters. Moreover, as interpreters began to collect different interpretations of biblical texts, they tended to deal with conflicts between authorities by harmonizing such opinions rather than simply keeping some and discarding others...

In general, medieval Latin commentators through the thirteenth century rarely abandon the principle that the text makes some kind of sense. Thus even when the Aristotelian text is extremely cryptic, corrupt, or terse, commentators make every effort to give the text a clear and consistent sense, even if it must be almost completely constructed...

Medieval philosophy remains one centered on authoritative texts and, hence, on their commentaries...medieval philosophical writers understood their own work as emerging out of a tradition of authorities rather than abstraction from or opposition to a tradition...[also] their work emerges out of an encounter with texts rather than in an unmediated contact with ideas problems, or arguments.¹

There is something here quite remarkable. Aristotle was a close observer of nature. Alexander the Great ordered his generals to send back to Aristotle any unusual plant, animal, or mineral they might come across. Here we see the scholastics accept Aristotle's work, but not his method! They paid no attention to the natural world around them (except for women and wine). Ironically, the term Aristotelian has come to mean the opposite of the methods actually used by the master.

One of the main reasons for this paradox is that in ancient and medieval times there was no way to accurately measure time. Also there were no compasses, barometers, microscopes, telescopes, or most of the instruments that are found in any high school today. In addition, the Arabic numerals and the importation of algebra were yet to come. Without this basic math, instruments of measurement lose most of their power.

As noted above, the medieval universities' utilitarian function was to produce educated people to run the machinery of church and state. Officially, the most important subject was theology, to which everything else was considered secondary. Here again, Aristotle

was used. Aristotle's view of God was not anthropomorphic. He referred to God as the "Unmoved Mover" or "First Cause."

What in Aristotle's thought was the unconscious principle of motion and immanent form of the world, the Unmoved Mover, became, especially at the hands of Aquinas in the thirteenth century, the philosophical description of the God of Christianity.²

The definition of God that would hold for the scholastics would also be valid for Aristotle as he was then understood:

According to the classical theism of Augustine, Anselm, Aquinas and their adherents, God is radically unlike creatures in that he is devoid of any complexity or composition, whether physical or metaphysical. Besides lacking spatial and temporal parts, God is free of matter/form composition, potency/act composition, and existence/essence composition. There is no real distinction between god as subject of his attribute and his attributes. God is thus in a sense requiring clarification identical to each of his attributes, which implies that each attribute is identical to every other one. God is omniscient, then, not in virtue of instantiating or exemplifying omniscience—which would imply a real distinction between God and the property of omniscience—but by being omniscience. And the same holds for each of the divine omni-attributes: God is what he has. As identical to each of his attributes, God is identical to his nature. And since his nature or essence is identical to his existence God is identical to his existence. This is the doctrine of divine simplicity. It is to be understood as an affirmation of God's absolute transcendence of creatures. God is not only radically non-anthropomorphic, but radically non-creaturomorphic, not only in respect of the properties he possesses, but in his manner of possessing them. God, we could say, differs in his very ontology from any and all created beings.³

Impact on Judaism

One of the greatest figures in Jewish history was Moses Maimonides (1135–1204). Although he was born in Spain, his family left there when he was thirteen and moved to Morocco. It was there, as a young man, that he learned medicine from Muslim scholars. Throughout all his travels, he sought out Jewish scholars and became deeply knowledgeable about Jewish law. In fact, he is described as "The most illustrious figure in Judaism in the post-Talmudic era, and one of the greatest of all time."⁴ In addition to his encyclopedic knowledge of Jewish sacred text and tradition, he became a great scholar of Aristotle, as well as the Arab commentaries on Aristotle. His exposure to Aristotle changed his life. It led him to develop a passionate desire to reconcile reason with Torah (revelation).

This conflict between religion and reason was neither new nor unique to Judaism. It continues to this day. All of us have faced it individually in one form or another, and religious and social organizations have been made and unmade by this inherent conflict. The medieval Jewish community was divided over Maimonides:

Maimonides' grandiose attempt at a synthesis between the Jewish faith and Greek-Arab Aristotelian philosophy was received with enthusiasm in some circles, mainly of the upper strata of Jewish society, and with horror and dismay in others, imbued with the mysticism and dreading the effects of Greek thought on Jewish beliefs. The old and

continuously smoldering issue of “Athens versus Jerusalem” conceived in the Talmud as the problem of hokhmah yevanit (Greek wisdom), now burst into flames. Essentially the problem is one of the synthesis or the absolute antithesis between monotheistic revealed faith and intellectually formulated philosophy.⁵

In order to address this issue, he wrote a book entitled *The Guide for the Perplexed*. This book was written for scholars, as Maimonides was very unwilling to trust uneducated people with beliefs that might lead them astray. In the *Guide*, he addressed a number of specific problems. One of these was the question of whether God created the universe at a point in time (as stated in Genesis), or whether the universe has been in existence forever (Aristotle). Maimonides concludes that if Aristotle could prove the preexistence of the universe, that he (Maimonides) would interpret scripture accordingly:

For if the Creation had been demonstrated by proof, even if according to the Platonic hypothesis, all arguments of the philosophers against us would be of no avail. If, on the other hand, Aristotle had a proof for his theory, the whole teaching of Scripture would be rejected, and we should be forced to other opinions.⁶

Regarding the Nature of Evil:

Maimonides accepts the neo-Platonic doctrine that evil is not an independent principle but rather the privation, or absence, of good.⁷

Regarding eschatology:

The Messiah is an earthly king, descended from the house of David. He will bring the Jews back to their country, but his major accomplishment will be to bring peace and tranquility to the world, thereby facilitating full observance of God’s commandments. The messiah will die of old age and be succeeded by his son, the latter by his son, and so on. No cataclysmic events will take place during Messianic times, but the world will continue in its established order.⁸

Regarding the purpose of the Law:

The beliefs which a man must accept are graded according to his ability. There are true beliefs, such as the existence of God, His unity, and His incorporeality, which everyone must accept regardless of intellectual ability; and there are beliefs, such as that God gets angry at those who disobey Him, which have primarily a political function and are considered necessary beliefs. Ordinary men will accept the Law only if they are promised rewards or threatened with punishment, and it is the function of the necessary beliefs to provide such motivation... they are unnecessary for the philosopher, who obeys the law because it is the right thing to do regardless of consequences.⁹

It is important to note that the upper classes were most receptive to Maimonides’ synthesis. However, those imbued with mysticism were the most immune. It needs also to be noted that Jewish communities near the center of culture, Spain, North Africa, and southern France, were most sympathetic to Maimonides, while the outlying Jewish centers (northern France) were often hostile. We will see in the nineteenth century that Marxism had its greatest hold among educated German Jews, and least appeal among the poorer and less assimilated, and less university-educated Eastern European orthodox and Hasidic Jews.

As for the definition of God, I think that given above by Aquinas would be essentially identical to that envisaged by Maimonides.

Before concluding with Maimonides, we must note another side to him. He produced a very orthodox codification of Torah Law, and also wrote *The Thirteen Principles of Faith*, which is prominent in the daily prayer book for Jews. The thirteenth statement reads:

I believe with complete faith that there will be a resuscitation of the dead whenever the wish emanates from the Creator, Blessed be His Name and exalted is his mention, forever and for all eternity.¹⁰

There is clearly a variance between the philosophical Maimonides and the orthodox Maimonides. This raises questions regarding what he truly believed. One thing is certain: he did not trust the masses to make their own decisions, and he realized the danger of his writings, and discouraged non-scholars and young men from reading them. We see expressed, in the microcosm of this one man, a clear foreshadowing of the philosophical split that will come to full fruition during the period of the Enlightenment and which continues to this day.

Impact on Islam

The impact of Greek philosophy was at least as great on Islam as on Judaism or Christianity. However interesting the subject may be, it is beyond the scope of this book.

Neo-Platonism

I have made only passing reference to Plato in the course of this book. I must note here, for the sake of completeness, that the theories of Plato provide an alternative view of the universe to those of Aristotle. These views will have more impact on Jewish and Christian thought during the various Enlightenments, but that also is beyond the scope of this book.

1 Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy Online, sv "Aristotle," <http://aristotle.stanford.edu>

2 Samuel Enoch Stumpf, *Philosophy: History and Problems* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983), 92.

3 Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy Online, sv "Aristotle."

4 *Encyclopedia Judaica*. 1st ed. sv "Maimonidian Controversy."

5 *Ibid*.

6 Moses Maimonides, *The Guide for the Perplexed*. trans. by M. Friedlander (New York: Dover Publications, 1956), 200.

7 *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, sv "Maimonidian Controversy."

8 *Encyclopedia Judaica*, *Ibid*.

9 *Ibid*.

10 *The Complete Artscroll Siddur* (New York: Mesorah Publications, 1995), 179.

THRESHOLD OF THE MODERN

An Old Story Continues

We left off with the wanderings of the Jews in chapter 3. Driven out of France, Germany, and England by the violence of the Crusades and out of Spain by the order of Ferdinand and Isabella in 1492, there was a great redistribution of the world's Jewish population. Half of the total came from Europe, and are called, as previously noted, Ashkenazi (probably an archaic term for German). The other half came from Spain. We have seen that they are called Sephardim. The Sephardim settled primarily in the lands of the Ottoman Empire. Some few of both types found safety in the Dutch provinces (see Holland, map V). This book will not follow the path of the Sephardim, except for Baruch Spinoza and Uriel da Costa.

At the same time as the Jews were forced to leave Western Europe, there was a strong population shift and growth in the population of Poland and Lithuania. These areas were newly Christianized and were in need of people who could manage trade and supply credit to growing economies, as well as possess the literacy necessary to run estates and new industries such as liquor, furs, timber, and grain distribution. Jews were used by the landed nobility to collect taxes and generally to manage the estates of the nobility. The system used was that of tax farming, in which the landowner would sell to the Jew the right to collect taxes. Whatever, if anything, the Jew could obtain from the peasants above this amount, would be his profit. Many times the Jew was forced to do this task and would have to pay out more than he could collect. This system was very advantageous to the nobility, because the onus of actual collection fell on the Jew, and the hatred of the peasants could thus be deflected from the nobility.

This East European expansion was on the surface similar to that which was to take place in the not-yet formed United States. But in the United States, the role of capital and business was to be viewed as a national asset, and businessmen were honored rather than despised. The many cultural differences between Europe and the United States (not yet in existence) will be considered in future chapters.

As most of the eastwardly migrating Jews came from German-speaking territory, they carried with them a dialect of German, eponymously called Yiddish. They also brought with them the holy books. They were distinctly "other." The Jews came into new lands with their own well-defined culture. While there were certainly cultural differences between Poles and Lithuanians, they were nothing compared to the "otherness" of Jews. Jews had a religion which was very different, with a different Sabbath day. They had dietary restrictions that precluded them from sharing dinner with their neighbors. This was a significant handicap, as "braking bread together" has always been a source of communal identification. Their dress was different. Their body features were sufficiently different from those of their neighbors as to be noticeable. Their sacred language was not that of the Church. They did not intermarry. They did not share the folklore and songs of the people around them. They tended to be more literate and to be involved in trade.

Returning to Poland-Lithuania, we find the Jews taking up residence in specific quarters of towns and cities. This was convenient for Jew and Gentile because the two separate cultures had no desire to merge. They were locked together in economic, but not social, bonds. There was almost universal hatred of the Jew on the part of the peasant and the

clergy, especially the lower clergy. From the point of view of the nobility, the Jew was a kind of human cow; it was useful as long as it could be milked. When it no longer produced milk, it could be slaughtered. The nobility seemed to have less visceral hatred toward Jews, because Jews were so much beneath them. After all, a man may not like cockroaches, but he does not find them important enough to hate.

Two events devastated the Jews of Poland-Lithuania in the middle of the seventeenth century, one physically, and one spiritually. The physical trial was the Cossack reign of terror under Bogdan Chmielnicki (ca. 1593–1657). He entered history unwillingly. After serving in the Polish army against the Turks, he returned to the Ukraine. There, he settled down quietly on his paternal estate, and in all probability history would never have known his name if the intolerable persecution of a neighboring Polish squire, who stole his hayricks and flogged his infant son to death, had not converted the thrifty and acquisitive Cossack husbandman into one of the most striking and sinister figures of modern times. Failing to get redress nearer home, he determined to seek for justice at Warsaw, whither he had been summoned with other Cossack delegates to assist Wladislaus I in his long-projected war against the Turks. The king, perceiving him to be a man of some education and intelligence, appointed him *pisarz* or secretary of the registered Cossacks, and he subsequently served under Koniecpolski in the Ukraine campaign of 1646. His hopes of distinction were, however, cut short by a decree of the Polish diet, which, in order to vex the king, refused to sanction the continuance of the war. Chmielnicki, now doubly hateful to the Poles as being both a royalist and a Cossack, was again maltreated and chicaned, and only escaped from gaol [jail] by bribing his gaolers. Thirsting for vengeance, he fled to the Cossack settlements on the lower Dnieper and thence sent messages to the khan of the Crimea, urging a simultaneous invasion of Poland by the Tatars and Cossacks (1647).¹

The invasion occurred.

Throughout the Ukraine the Polish gentry was hunted down, flayed and burnt alive, blinded, and sawn asunder. Every manor-house was reduced to ashes. Every Uniate and Catholic priest was hung up before his own altar, along with a Jew and a hog...

In June 1649, arrayed in cloth of gold and mounted on a white charger, Chmielnicki made his triumphal entry into Kiev, where he was hailed as the Maccabeus of the Orthodox faith, and permitted the committal of unspeakable atrocities on the Jews and Roman Catholics.²

The remembrance of this horror in the minds of the Jews of Eastern Europe lingered as the greatest slaughter of Jews of modern history until the holocaust.

This tragedy was an assault on the physical well-being of the Jews. The advent of a false Messiah, Shabbetai Zevi, was a spiritual blow, and an assault upon the spiritual well-being of the Jews. Shabbetai Zevi (1626–1676) was born to a prosperous family in the Greek part of the Ottoman Empire. As a child and young man, he demonstrated great intelligence and was capable of enormous Talmudic and Kabbalist scholarship. He was also very charismatic. However, he was also mentally ill, suffering from periods of profound depression and delusions of grandeur. Suspecting that there was something

spiritually wrong with him, Shabbetai went to consult a man in Gaza [in Palestine] named Nathan, who was supposed to have been given powers of healing directly from God. Unfortunately, Nathan of Gaza confirmed Shabbetai in his delusion, and with support from similar believers in Palestine, Shabbetai went forth with the message that he was the Messiah. Unfortunately, the healer was as sick as the patient. Because of the influence of Kabbalah, the belief that people could influence God to bring about the Redemption by acts of piety (Tikkun Ha'Olim / Healing the World), Jews throughout the Ottoman Empire began to engage in acts of atonement such as fasting, self-mortification, and alms-giving (1665). The group delusion spread quickly to Eastern Europe (1666), where the horrors of the Chmielnicki massacres left Jews hungry for a miracle. It is understandable, that the people, feeling helpless, would be susceptible to any promise, however unrealistic it might have been. When reality offers no viable choice, the tortured mind can take refuge in either stoic acceptance or insanity.

While in Ottoman territory, Shabbetai was taken to the court of the Turkish Sultan, and there offered the choice of death or conversion. He left the interview wearing a turban (Sept. 16, 1666). Unsurprisingly, his predictions of Redemption proved hollow. A great disappointment followed. The next Messianic movement to engulf large numbers of Jews would be Marxism in the 19th, 20th, and now, 21st century. Unfortunately, this fatal delusion was not limited to Jews, and in its contagion spread to all races and caused untold harm not only to Jews, but to millions of non-Jews also. The evil continues today, and, despite its consistent failure, time and again, grim reality does not seem to scotch it.

A New Story Starts

Again we return to the map of Europe. (Please see map V). Stationing ourselves in the Swiss Alps, we notice that a river begins from the runoff of these mountains. This river runs north and west, generally dividing modern-day France from Germany, or in historic terms, Gaul from Germania. This river, the Rhine, terminates in the North Sea, at the Dutch coast. Still in the Alps, we notice another river formed from Alpine runoff. This river, the Danube, flows in the opposite direction, that is, to the east. The Danube has an enormous traverse, going from Switzerland all the way to the Black Sea.

In the year 1500, the vast majority of people living in Europe on both sides of the Rhine were Roman Catholic. Along the north bank of the Danube, the inhabitants of Austria, present-day Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Poland were overwhelmingly Roman Catholic. The population south of the Danube was also largely Roman Catholic. Exceptions to this were the people of Bulgaria and Greece, who were Orthodox, and those inhabitants of the southern Balkans who had adopted Islam while under Turkish rule.

Look again at these two rivers. They divide Europe into a northern half and a southern half. During the time of the Roman Empire, the area south of these rivers was relatively securely held by the Roman legions. The area north of this line was either not secure at all or was at risk of barbarian incursions and chronic revolt. Officially, the Western Roman Empire ended in AD 476. Jumping ahead to the year AD 1500, we note that the population on both sides of these river valleys was Roman Catholic (with the exceptions noted above). Yet in the year 1600, much of the population north of this line was Protestant. People who had been Catholic for almost 1000 years abandoned the

traditional religion in a few decades of the first half of the sixteenth century. This was one of the most momentous events in the history of the world. What happened and why did it happen?

As background we go back to the time of the Roman Empire. The lands south of the two great rivers absorbed a great deal of Roman culture. Many retiring Roman legionnaires were paid off by being given land grants in the above-mentioned locales. The languages of Italy, Spain, France, and Romania reflect this influence. Roman legal traditions were maintained, and many cultural aspects of the Roman social order remained. The Catholic Church represented the shadowy continuance of the empire. As the hold of the empire was less secure to the north and east, so the Roman tradition was less strong. But there were many other reasons for the failure of Catholicism to hold the north. The lightning strike that ignited the Protestant Reformation occurred on Oct. 31, 1517. On that date Martin Luther nailed to the door of Castle Church in Wittenberg, Germany, his Ninety-five Theses. His was not the first attempt to question Catholic orthodoxy, as previous attempts had been made, only to be quashed by the forces of Church and State. In the extreme, heretics were burned alive, discouraging their activities. Luther, however, questioned Roman Catholic orthodoxy at a time when the prestige of the papacy was at low ebb and the German princes were open to any reason to justify arresting the flow of money to Rome. In addition, they greedily eyed the real estate holdings of the Church, which had grown over the centuries by endowments from the faithful. Luther's action at that time was a response to the sale of indulgences by a papal representative named Johann Tetzel:

This man [Tetzel] went around the country proclaiming that as soon as the money clinked in the chest, the soul of some dead relative flew from purgatory, and that by buying a papal pardon the purchaser secured plenary remission of sins and the grace of God...and many of the people of Wittenberg went out to buy heaven at a bargain. Luther was sickened by seeing what he believed to be the deception of poor people in being taught to rely on these wretched papers instead of on real, lively faith...He pointed out that the doctrine of the Church was very uncertain, especially in regard to the freeing of souls from purgatory; that contrition was the only gate to God's pardon; that works of charity were better than the buying of indulgences, and that the indulgence-sellers were extremely scandalous and likely to foment heresy among the simple.³

Martin Luther had tweaked the lion's tail and survived. It was the signal for a massive anti-Catholic movement. The next most significant figure to challenge the Church was a Frenchman, John Calvin. In 1541 he wrote in French his Institutes of the Christian Religion. The work is summarized by Professor Smith:

The sole purpose of the universe, and the sole intent of its Creator, was the glorification of the Deity. Man's chief end was to "glorify God and enjoy Him forever." God accomplished this self-exaltation in all things, but chiefly through men, his noblest work, and He did it in various ways, by the salvation of some and the damnation of others. And his act was purely arbitrary; he foreknew and predestined the fate of every man from the beginning; he damned and saved irrespective of foreseen merit. "God's eternal decree" Calvin himself called "frightful." The outward sign of election to grace he thought was moral behavior, and in this respect he demanded the uttermost from himself and from his followers. The highest virtue was faith, a matter more of the heart than of the reason.⁴

Crossing the English Channel, we note that Henry VIII also followed the lead of the German princes. Step by step, he severed England's connection with the papacy. His actions culminated in the passage of the Act of Supremacy by Parliament in 1534. This Act "declared that the king's majesty 'justly and rightfully is and ought to be supreme head of the Church of England.' "5

And thus ended Roman Catholic hegemony in Europe.

Catholic and Calvinist

The early Protestants were for the most part Calvinist, and it was the Calvinist theology that the Pilgrim Fathers brought to New England and which informed the early history of the New England colonies. Of all religious theologies, it was the Calvinist that had the greatest impact on early American history and will be of chief concern in our consideration of its mutation from a clear statement of iron faith to its current iteration as secular humanism. It is the Protestant branch of Christianity that will be our chief interest.

The differences between Catholic and Calvinist beliefs are profound. Calvinists believe that God has determined the fate of each person ever born because God is omniscient. Catholics believe that people are free to choose between good and evil. A Calvinist would respond that if moral freedom existed, God would not be omniscient, hence limited in some way. To maintain that God is limited in any way would be sinful. Now, despite this difference in view between Calvinist and Catholic, it is curious that St. Augustine (AD 354–430), a Father of the Church, and Bishop of Hippo, held the Calvinist view. There were others; the line between heresy and orthodoxy in Catholicism is frequently hard to draw.

Calvinists believe that most of the sacraments are useless ritual and are meaningless to God. The Catholic Church holds that they are essential to salvation. The Calvinists believe that man communicates directly with God and that no priest is necessary to mediate between God and man. Calvinists believe that the Bible contains all of God's words and that everyone should have access to and read the Bible. Traditional Catholic belief was that laymen could not understand the Bible and that to translate it out of Latin would be dangerous. They supplied their believers with Church law and dogma and resisted any direct appeal to the Bible because laymen could misunderstand it and fall into heresy. Calvinists felt that everyone should read the Bible and that no one had the authority to render an "official" meaning to Biblical text. Obviously, they felt it imperative to translate the Bible into every spoken language. They still do.

The Catholic Church is episcopal in structure. That means it is run like an army, from top down. The pope, at the top, makes a final declaration of what God wills, and the interpretation is transmitted from pope to cardinal, to archbishop, to bishop, to monsignor, to parish priest, to congregant. In Calvinist religions, generally (there are some exceptions such as the Scottish Presbyterians), each individual congregation chooses its own pastor and has no authority over any other congregation. This form of church governance is called congregational. If a congregant in a Calvinist church disagrees with beliefs of his individual church, he is free to join another congregation.

Simultaneously with the questioning of Roman Catholic orthodoxy, there was a questioning of the Aristotelian orthodoxy. That is the subject of the next chapter.

1 Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th ed., sv “Chmielnicki.”

2 Ibid.

3 Preserved Smith, *The Age of the Reformation* (New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1920), 66.

4 Ibid., 164.

5 Ibid., 293.

CHAPTER 17

THE ENLIGHTENMENT

The period of the Enlightenment is so rich in meaning and material that it is not possible to give an overview of it in this brief history. Therefore, I will limit my consideration of the Enlightenment to those aspects directly related to this area of study. Our efforts will consider some of the developments in science and philosophy.

Science

The first figure to be discussed will be Galileo (1564–1642). Up to his time, “science” as such did not exist. Also, by Galileo’s time, the mechanical clock had been invented, which allowed him to make some key observations on the relationship between time and motion with regard to falling objects. Before Galileo, anyone interested in explaining natural phenomena looked not to the material under consideration (stars, animals, plants, physics, matter, etc.), but to the writings of Aristotle. Galileo decided actually to look at the stars, moon, and planets through a telescope. (Telescopes and mechanical clocks had recently been invented.) Galileo was one of the first of the inquiring minds to enter the seventeenth century with the curiosity of Aristotle, but with the basic instruments of measurement of time and space, as well as a powerful system of mathematics (algebra, with the Arabic numbers, including zero).

He concluded that the earth rotates around the sun; conventional belief was that the all heavenly bodies rotated around the earth. Galileo was hauled before the Inquisition and forced to recant his beliefs. The Catholic Church felt at that time that belief in a heliocentric solar system was heresy. Thus Galileo’s works were put on the Index of forbidden books, where they remained until 1832. Surprisingly, many Protestants had less difficulty accepting a heliocentric solar system. The Catholic Church paid a price by turning a blind eye to scientifically demonstrable astronomic data for 200 years, even into the twentieth century. I know of no Catholic theoretical physicist who has won a Nobel Prize; Nobel Prize winners in this field are largely Protestants, Jews and Asians. But there was also a gain to the Church; the suspicion of the novel led to a rate of change in dogma that is glacial; thus there is a comforting continuity of tradition and practice that has prevented the Church from deteriorating into secular humanism, as happened to Calvinist and Jewish orthodoxy.

René Descartes (1596–1650) was a contemporary of Galileo. He did his major work in France and in Holland. He agreed with Galileo regarding cosmology, but was unwilling

to write for publication on the subject, fearing the reaction of the Church. Descartes' major contribution to science was by way of mathematics; he was able to apply the concepts of algebra to geometry, thus doing the work necessary to produce analytic geometry. While Descartes was still living, and in the year that Galileo died, Isaac Newton was born. He was able to integrate the analytic geometry of Descartes with the studies of motion begun by Galileo and perform the greatest advance in mathematics and physics of anyone in the entire history of the human race. No single human being has ever contributed more to science and mathematics than Isaac Newton. In discussing his work, Newton said, "I stand on the shoulders of giants," referring, undoubtedly to Galileo and Descartes. Physics, as known up to the time of Einstein, was primarily the work of Newton. In order to describe his physics, he invented the mathematics of differential and integral calculus. Without this mathematical tool, modern science would be impossible. (In fairness, I must point out here that the principles of calculus were worked out independently and at the same time by the German philosopher Gottfried von Leibniz). Few dates in history are as important as 1687. In that year Newton published *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica*. This work presented both his new mathematics and physics to the world.

It is interesting that the work of Galileo marks the chief contribution of Catholic intellectuals to theoretical physics, although not to higher mathematics. The Protestant universities, from that time to today, continue to have much greater productivity in theoretical science. Engineering and the applied sciences do not appear to suffer the same dichotomy. The differences between freedom and license, between enough and too much, are hard to draw. The cost-benefit analysis is hard to perform.

The seventeenth century saw advances in science and mathematics that have never been even approximated before or after. In comparison, from that point on all advances have built on the massive foundation of the seventeenth century. Subsequent advances have been comparatively incremental.

The results of the progress above were prerequisite to the Industrial Revolution, which has materially enriched all the inhabitants of Europe and is now transforming Asia. But the scientific and mathematical revolutions raised grave philosophical questions.

Philosophy: Great Britain

Every philosopher from the seventeenth century forward has had to face the question posed by Newton's physics. Newton demonstrated that if you can determine the mass of a moving body, its direction, its velocity, and resistance to movement, you could predict where it would be at any given time in the future. Anyone doubting the validity of his science might argue, but in the end no one was brave enough (or stupid enough) to attempt to disprove it by standing at the predicted point of impact of a cannonball. Unlike Galileo's claim of heliocentricity, the option of denying Newton's physics would mean the difference between winning and losing a battle. No one disputes that sort of practical proof. Even the Islamic terrorists, who hate the United States and have an otherwise medieval religious ideology, are keen to adopt our most recent gains in organic chemistry (the chemistry of explosives and toxic substances).

Following the ramifications of Newton's physics, if one could predict the impact site of a cannonball (which one can do), one can also predict the future location of planets, given

adequate data. There is a slight correction for relativity, as per Einstein's 1903 theory, but the effects of relativity were not large enough to be measured until the late nineteenth century). At the other extreme, any minute body of matter that you could find or make could be demonstrated to follow the same laws. Anyone doubting this could be invited to try out the cannonball experiment noted above, but with a small bullet.

If everything in the material world could be predicted, given enough data, what is the role of God in the universe? How can miracles be explained? If everything moves according to Newton's laws of mechanics, is God necessary? What about human behavior? If we know what a person's past experiences were, can we not predict how he will behave in a given set of conditions in the future? If everyone is merely a product of his particular circumstances, is anyone responsible for his actions? A French philosopher stated, "tout compris c'est tout pardonner" (everything understood is everything pardoned).

These are the questions that the philosophy of the Enlightenment had to address. The questions are still relevant. So let us see how the wise men of the day addressed the problem. The first man we consider is John Locke (1632–1704), and the first thing we notice about him is that he wrote after Newton's great work was published. As Newton, Locke was English. In 1690, Locke published *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. This work attempts to determine, in a scientific manner, what people can and cannot know about our world. Locke states that the mind is like a "blank slate," with no innate ideas. Everything we know is the result of experience. Experience comes to us through our five senses. Thus what is "real" is always beyond our ability to know absolutely, since our knowledge is necessarily indirect. The input from our senses provides us with simple ideas. When our mind processes these simple ideas, by comparing them, and by blending them, we create in our minds complex ideas.¹ His thinking demonstrates the carryover from the logic of Newton's physics into philosophy. A Scott, David Hume (1711–1776), took up where Locke left off. Not only did he agree that we cannot know what is real, he also concluded we cannot assume causality. What is the "assumption of causality"? Explanation: Let us assume that A happens. One moment later B happens. Every time A happens, we notice that B happens. For example, if you hit your finger with a hammer (A), in the next instant you feel pain (B). If you repeat the process, you get the same result. Hume summarizes this "assumption of causality" by stating the three conditions that lead us to assume it. (1) Contiguity, that is, A and B happen very close to each other; (2) Constant connection, that is, we always see B after A occurs; and (3) Priority in time, that is, A always comes before B. These three criteria lead our common sense to presume causality, but, states Hume, there is no necessary reason why causality should hold. This led Hume to skepticism and perhaps to periods of atheism.²

The seventeenth century was truly phenomenal. In addition to Galileo, Descartes, Newton, John Locke, Adam Smith, David Hume, Thomas Hobbes (whom we will discuss), George Berkeley, and Leibniz, we have Spinoza. In 1492, all Jews were expelled from Spain and in 1497, from Portugal. Among the thousands of Jewish refugees, a few found safe haven in Holland. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Holland was unique among European countries for having relative religious freedom. Among the refugee families were those of Spinoza and da Costa. Although the impact of Spinoza in philosophy was far greater, the biography of Uriel da Costa is more

instructive as an early prototype of the thought process that has contributed to development of ideology in some Jews. An early twentieth-century American writer noted that “the Jews are like a man carrying a precious vase from a BC culture to an AD culture. During the transition, the vase shatters. What we see now are the attempts to make something of the shards.” That is how the author (whose name I cannot recall) describes the origin of Marxism.

Philosophy: Holland

Uriel da Costa (1585–1640) was the son of a man whose family had been converted to Catholicism. The family was Portuguese, and Uriel’s father was a devout Catholic. Uriel knew of his Jewish background and became interested in Judaism. He began to study the Bible and concluded that he wanted to be Jewish. Since he couldn’t be Jewish in Portugal, he migrated to Amsterdam. Once in Amsterdam, he found the Jewish community too rigid and ritualistic. He labeled them “the Pharisees of Amsterdam.” He wrote a book condemning these “Pharisees”: *Examen dos Tradicoens Phariseas Conferidas con a Ley Escrita*. His book caused him to be excommunicated. He subsequently concluded that he needed to be part of a community, although he had not changed his religious opinions. He stated (privately) he would “become an ape among apes.” So he asked to be reinstated in the Jewish community and was accepted. However, in the next few years he began to doubt the Divine sanction for Mosaic Law and then began to assert that religions were human inventions. He ceased practicing Judaism and tried to prevent two Christians from converting to Judaism. For this last act, he was excommunicated again. A few years later, however, he sought to rejoin the Jewish community. This was permitted, provided he submitted to the very humiliating experience of public recantation, receiving thirty-nine lashes and prostrating himself so that the entire congregation could tread on him. He accepted these conditions and underwent the ordeal. However, shortly thereafter he committed suicide.³ This biographical sketch is valuable for several reasons. First, it shows the alienation that can come from the “precious vase” phenomenon. Secondly, it shows that the dominant culture has to be receptive to the revolt against the existing religious/social/political philosophy for the revolt to have a chance of success. Thirdly, it shows that the rebel has to be strong-willed in order to avoid being crushed by the status quo. In the case of da Costa, these conditions were not met; in the case of Spinoza (and later Marx), they were met.

A few years after the death of da Costa, Baruch Spinoza was born. He was born in Amsterdam to a family of Jewish Portuguese refugees. Whereas da Costa’s heretical beliefs were vague and not systematized, those of Spinoza were precisely thought out and written. He, too, was excommunicated because of his beliefs. In a nutshell, Spinoza equated God with nature. He was a strict determinist, believing that all of our actions are determined by our previous experience and that free will does not exist. And he was an atheist. He had a much stronger personality than da Costa and made a living as a lens grinder. His writings so impressed philosophers and some important public figures of the era, that he was offered the chairmanship of the department of philosophy at the University of Heidelberg by the Elector Palatine, but Spinoza declined, saying that he “preferred his quiet life of philosophical research to teaching.” He later changed his name from Baruch to Bernard “and became involved with some liberal Protestants.”⁴ There are

three points of interest here. The first is that the Jewish community of Holland had enough respect for the dominant Christian majority to want to avoid unnecessary provocation. Secondly, Spinoza's reaching out to liberal Protestants foreshadows what the Jewish Left in the United States would do in the twentieth century. Thirdly, it is important to note that Spinoza could not have had any impact on the outside world if he had lived in a ghetto. Holland and England were the only places that would allow a Jew sufficient civil rights to be involved in the intellectual and philosophical life of a nation. Is it safe to give Jews full civil rights? We will address this question in the closing chapters.

Philosophy: Germany

In Germany, the Enlightenment is called the Aufklärung. The most prominent philosopher of this period is Immanuel Kant (1728–1804). His work is critical to understanding epistemology (the theory of knowledge) as we know it today. Although not considered his major contribution to philosophy, Kant defined three concerns of every rational being. He calls them the three regulative ideas. It might be better to call them three human needs, because all rational beings must satisfy them in some way. The first is the mystery of one's own existence. The second is the mystery of the existence of the world in general. The third is the existence of the "sufficient cause of all cosmological series," i.e., God.⁵ I think that the power of his perception of these three needs has not been given the attention it deserves. I will go on to show that some men seek to fill the third need with ideologies. Marxism is the example I will use.

One point relevant regarding the Aufklärung is that most of the men who are so defined went through either the German university system or were educated in Stiften, Protestant seminaries. The period of the Aufklärung coincides with the reign of the Prussian⁶ King Frederick the Great. Although he was an autocrat, he was philosophically liberal, and, accordingly, the universities produced a large number of academics who were not conventionally religious. The king did not require religious orthodoxy of his scholars. Frederick had no suspicion that when you let the cat in, you also let in the fleas.

So far we have seen the questioning of religious orthodoxy (chapter 16) and the questioning of Aristotelian orthodoxy (this chapter). Could questioning of political theory be far behind? The next chapter faces the issue squarely.

1 Samuel Enoch Stumpf, *Philosophy: History and Problems*, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983), 255–62.

2 *Ibid.*, 273–276.

3 *Encyclopedia Judaica*, 1st ed. sv "Costa, Uriel da."

4 *Ibid.*, sv "Spinoza, Baruch."

5 Stumpf, 300.

6 The old name for the largest German state.

CHAPTER 18

GOVERNMENT: THEORY AND PRACTICE

Theory: Point

During the Enlightenment, two British authors wrote books on the theory of government that are still important today. They present opposing views. They are useful today because they are brief, clear, and complete. The first author we will look at is Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679), whose principle work is *Leviathan*. The book makes the case for a government which gives absolute power to the king. Hobbes is motivated by fear and pessimism. The two go together. In this sense his motivation is identical to that of the Jewish Left. In addition to sharing their pessimism, he also foreshadows their social and political solutions.

The term *Leviathan* comes from the Book of Job in which God describes a sea monster, “king over all majestic wild beasts.” “Its very sneezings flash forth light, and its eyes are like the beams of dawn. Out of its mouth there go lightning flashes, Even sparks of fire make their escape. Out of its nostrils smoke goes forth, Like a furnace set aflame even with rushes.” Hobbes states that the king should be feared by his subjects as if he were a terrible monster. Only such a government, felt Hobbes, could check man’s destructive impulses. Below I will cite some quotes from Hobbes that will summarize in his own words his beliefs and how they relate to today.

Premise: Human behavior is predetermined. Free will does not exist.

And yet, because every act of man’s will, and every desire, and inclination proceedeth from some cause, and that from another cause, in a continual chain, whose first link is in the hand of God the first of all causes, they proceed from necessity. So that to him that could see the connexion of those causes, the necessity of all men’s voluntary actions, would appear manifest. (Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Chapter XXI)

Communism and left-wing thought require the premise that the environment determines how people behave. If genetic factors are paramount, government intervention would be of limited effect, but if environmental factors (like welfare benefits) could improve people’s lives, then the more we give people, the better they will do. Governmental meddling means public sector jobs. Public sector jobs create clientela, who respond by voting for their benefactors. In this manner, liberals buy votes by making dependents out of welfare recipients, as well as the bureaucrats who serve them. The really neat thing about this little racket is that liberals can use tax dollars (other people’s money) to buy votes for themselves. So liberals tax productive citizens, take their money, give the money to those who do not produce, and harvest the votes they have bought with money they stole from the people who actually work.

Premise: People are basically equal in talents and abilities. People should basically be paid the same. An official sets the wage scale.

Nature hath made men so equal, in the faculties of the body, and mind; as that though there be found one man sometimes manifestly stronger in body, or of quicker mind than another; yet when all is reckoned together, the difference between man, and man, is not so considerable, as that one man can thereupon claim to himself any benefit, to which another may not pretend, as well as he. (Ibid., Chapter XIII)

The question who is the better man, has no place in the condition of mere nature; where all men are equal...yet because all men that think themselves equal, will not enter into

conditions of peace but upon equal terms, such equality must be admitted. And therefore...I put this, that every man acknowledge another for his equal in nature. (Ibid., Chapter XV)

And distributive justice, the justice of an arbitrator; that is to say, the act of defining what is just. Wherein, being trusted by them that make him arbitrator, if he perform his trust, he is said to distribute to every man his own; and this is indeed just distribution, and many be called (though improperly) distributive justice; but more properly equity. (Ibid., Chapter XV)

That such things as cannot be divided, be enjoyed in common...otherwise proportionably to the number of them that have right. For otherwise the distribution is unequal, and contrary to equity. (Ibid., Chapter XV)

For equal distribution, is the law of nature; and other means of equal distribution cannot be imagined. (Ibid., Chapter XV)

From the above, we see that it is easier to govern men if they are all uniform. When there are no class differences, there will be less strife, and rulers will have an easier time controlling the state. There will be no free market in distribution of goods and services: state appointed arbitrators will assign distribution to men based on equity, or fairness. (Who will keep the arbitrators fair is another issue we address below.) This is exactly the sort of system Hillary Clinton and the Jewish Left wish to impose on us by arbitrating “values” for certain kinds of work. Naturally, their work, as arbitrators, would be the most valuable. The arbitrators run the show, as was the case in the Soviet Union, where the Poliburo had absolute authority, and in Castro’s Cuba, where the Communist Party nomenclatura decides who gets what. According to the Jewish Left, this is the ideal state.

We raised the issue above about who will keep the arbitrators honest. Thomas Hobbes, unlike the Jewish Left, is both clear and honest about this issue. In a state-run system, you cannot keep them honest, so you simply accept their dishonesty. You simply state that their dishonesty is still “justice.” Watch the word magic below. See how it is done; see and be amazed:

Premise: Justice is whatever the sovereign (state) says it is.

For it has already been shown, that nothing the sovereign representative can do to a subject, on what pretence soever, can properly be called injustice; or injury; because every subject is author of every act the sovereign doth; so that he never wanteth right to any thing, otherwise, than as he himself is the subject of God, and bound thereby to observe the laws of nature. And therefore it may, and doth often happen in commonwealths, that a subject may be put to death, by command of the sovereign power, and yet neither do the other wrong. (Ibid., Chapter XXI)

Secondly, because the right of bearing the person of them all, is give to him they make sovereign, by consent only of one to another, and not of him to any of them; there happen no breach of covenant on the part of the sovereign; and consequently none of his subjects, by the pretence of forfeiture, can be freed from his subjection. (Ibid., Chapter XVIII)

Thirdly, because the major part hath by consenting voices declared a sovereign...because every subject is by this institution author of all the actions, and judgments of the sovereign instituted; it follows that whatsoever he doth, it can be no injury to any of his

subjects; nor ought he to be by any of them accused of injustice...but by this institution of a commonwealth, every particular man is author of all the sovereign does: and consequently he that complaineth of injury from his sovereign complaineth of that whereof he himself is author. (Ibid., Chapter XVIII)

The logic is impeccable. The people have contracted among themselves to be ruled. Note that the contract does not bind the sovereign. Thus the sovereign has no contractual obligations to the people. The power of the state is supreme; there is no Bill of Rights. This is the logical and legal kernel of belief that unifies Hobbes' thought. Stalin could not have said it better.

Premise: Religion is a (useful) construct.

And therefore the first founders, and legislators of commonwealths, among the Gentiles, whose ends were only to keep the people in obedience, and peace, have in all places taken care; first, to imprint in their minds a belief, that those precepts which they gave concerning religion, might not be thought to proceed from their own device; but from the dictates of some god, or other spirit or else that they themselves were of a higher nature than mere mortals, that their laws might easily be received...

And by these, and other such institutions, they obtained in order to their end, which was peace of the commonwealth, that the common people in their misfortunes, laying the fault on neglect, or error in their ceremonies, or on their own disobedience, to the laws, were the less apt to mutiny against their governors And thus you see how the religion of the Gentiles was a part of their policy. (Ibid., Chapter XII)

Karl Marx was pithier: "Religion is the opiate of the masses." Raymond Aron was more original: "Marxism is the opiate of the intellectuals."

Premise: Good and Evil are Relative.

For moral philosophy is nothing else but the science of what is good, and evil, in the conversation, and the society of mankind. Good, and Evil, are names that signify our appetites, and aversions; which in different tempers, customs, and doctrines of men are different. (Ibid., Chapter XV)

Premise: Peace at any Price.

Whatsoever therefore is consequent to a time of war, where every man is enemy to everyman; the same is consequent to the time, wherein men lie without other security, than what their own strength, and their own invention shall furnish them withal. In such condition, there is no place for industry; because fruit thereof is uncertain: and consequently no culture of the earth; no navigation, nor use of commodities that may be imported by sea; no commodious building; no instruments of moving, and removing such things as require much force; no knowledge of the face of the earth; no account of time; no arts; no letters; no society; and which is worst of all, continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short. (Ibid., Chapter XIII)

It is pretty clear that Jews in Europe led lives that fit the description of constant fear and danger of violent death. It is not surprising that they would adhere to a statist political philosophy that, although it might tax them highly, would provide physical security. The

first premise of my entire book is this quest for freedom from fear and for security on the part of Jews. Other premises have been alluded to, and still others remain to be developed.

Premise: Freedom of Speech and Press not Permitted.

It is annexed to the sovereignty, to be judge of what opinions and doctrines are averse, and what conducing to peace; and consequently, on what occasions, how far, and what men who are to be trusted withal, in speaking to multitudes of people; and who shall examine the doctrines of all books before they be published. For the actions of men proceed from their opinions; and in the well-governing of opinions, consisteth the well-governing of men's actions, in order to their peace and accord....It belongeth to him that hath the sovereign power, to be judge, or to constitute all judges of opinions and doctrines, as a thing necessary to peace; thereby to prevent discordant civil war. (Ibid., Chapter XVIII)

We see today the "political correctness" movement dictating what may and may not be said. Recently, Laurence Summers was deposed as president of Harvard University for the mere suggestion that there might be inherent differences in the mental makeup of man and woman. (It would be a surprise to me if the majority of the faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard were not Jewish.) I don't like the term political correctness because it understates what is happening. What is happening is censorship of ideas repugnant to the Left, especially the Jewish Left. The mainstream media not only neglects to present matters of fact not favorable to the Left, but also lies and exaggerates on a chronic basis. The mainstream media censors by acts of omission as well as commission. The media is controlled by the Jewish Left (see chapter 32). The U.S. today is in the grasp of an enormously powerful propaganda apparatus involving the schools from elementary through graduate education, as well as the media. Much more about this situation will be shown in succeeding chapters.

Premise: Competition is Bad.

So that, in the nature of man, we find three principle causes of quarrel. First, competition...(Ibid., Chapter XIII)

Competition is bad, in the opinion of the Jewish Left, because it is an exercise of personal freedom, which could (and has) led to harm to Jews. However, it would be self-defeating for the Jewish Left to give their true reason for fear and hatred of competition, so they disguise their opposition to competition as being a protest against "unfairness." And, as a corollary, if you put them or their minions in power, they will even things up. They would be only too happy to be sovereign, or to put in office a puppet, like Hillary Clinton. They have experience with placing puppets in high office; just look at Russia. They paved the road for Stalin.

Thomas Hobbes presents his opinions honestly. The Jewish Left is deceptive, claiming higher moral values. We will explore their hypocrisy in future chapters. For now, we can say that if Marx is their God, Hobbes must be their patron saint.

Theory: Counterpoint

The man who had the greatest influence on the writers of the American Constitution was an Englishman named John Locke (1632–1704). He is the same John Locke we cited as a

philosopher of a theory of knowledge (epistemology). He was a contemporary of Hobbes. I will cite quotes from him and comment about them as I did with Mr. Hobbes. The citations come from his Two Treatises on Government, printed in 1690. His opinions are the opposite of Hobbes', in that Locke has a rosy and optimistic view of human nature. Unlike the Jewish Left, he trusts mankind, and thinks that liberty and property are the safeguards of a decent social order.

Premise: Right of Self Defense.

Corollary: Right to Bear Arms.

Thus a Thief, whom I can not harm but by appeal to the Law, for having stolen all that I am worth, I may kill, when he sets on me to rob me, but of my Horse or Coat: because the Law which was made for my Preservation, where it cannot interpose to secure my Life from present force, which if lost, is capable of no reparation, permits my own defense, and the Right of War, a liberty to kill the aggressor, because the aggressor allows not time to appeal to our common Judge, nor the Decision of the Law, for remedy of a Case, where the mischief may be irreparable. Want of a common Judge with Authority, puts all Men in a state of Nature; Force without Right, upon a Man's Person, makes a State of War, both where there is and is not, a common Judge. (John Locke, Two Treatises on Government, Second Treatise: 19)

The Jewish Left wants to disarm all Americans because that will strengthen central power. The Jewish Left does not, and never did, trust the people. From their point of view, this is understandable. Even my own cousins (now deceased) were chased by armed Cossacks. I concede that it would have been better to be chased by unarmed Cossacks. However, the motivation of the Jewish Left is doubly flawed: this is not Ukraine, and it is selfishly parochial to put their own atavistic fears ahead of the legitimate well-being of the citizenry. Unfortunately, many, if not most, of the leading gun-grabbers are Jews.

Re: Corollary: I do not expect Mr. Locke will require me to meet a highwayman who is armed with sword and pistol when I have only my fingernails.

Premise: People are Basically Good.

My desire therefore to be loved of my equals in Nature, As much as possible may be, Imposes on me a natural Duty of bearing to themward, full the like affection; From which relation of equality between ourselves and them, that are as ourselves, what several rule and Canons, natural reason hath drawn for direction of life, no Man is ignorant. (Ibid. Second Treatise: 5)

Premise: Purpose of Government and Law: To Preserve Private Property.

The great and the chief end therefore, of men's uniting into Commonwealths, and putting themselves under Government, is the Preservation of their Property. (Ibid. Second Treatise: 124)

And the condition of Humane Life, which requires Labor and Materials to work on, necessarily introduces private Possessions. (Ibid. Second Treatise: 35)

Under Socialism, the purpose of the Law is to expropriate as much private property as possible. The expropriated property is then taken for the personal use of the sovereign, or

distributed to his clientela, to purchase their loyalty. The purchase is made in the interest of the sovereign with the goods and services extorted from the producers. All such programs are high on the agenda of the Jewish Left. They realize that the control of property distribution is the ultimate source of power in the state. Thus they agree with John Locke regarding the primacy of private property; they only differ in how it is to be distributed.

Premise: Unjust Laws are Not Binding.

For wherever violence is used, and injury done, though by hands appointed to administer Justice, it is still violence and injury, however colored with the name, Pretences, or Forms of Law, the end whereof being to protect and redress the innocent, by an unbiased application of it, to all who are under it; wherever that is not bona fide done, War is made upon the sufferers. (Ibid. Second Treatise: 20)

Premise: Sovereign is Bound by Law.

Therefore all Kings that are not Tyrants, or Perjured, will be glad to bound themselves within the Limits of their Laws... Thus the Learned King, who well understood the Notions of Things, makes the difference betwixt a King and a Tyrant to consist only in this, that one makes the Laws the Bounds of his Power, and the Good of the Publick, the end of his Government; the other makes all give way to his own Will and Appetite. (Ibid. Second Treatise: 200)

Tis a Mistake to think this Fault is proper only to Monarchies; other Forms of Government are liable to it, as well as that. For wherever the Power that is put in the hands for government of the People, and the Preservation of their Properties, is applied to other ends... There it presently becomes Tyranny, whether those that use it are one or many. (Ibid. Second Treatise: 201)

Although the liberal media, controlled by Jews (don't panic: I will prove this contention subsequently) did its best to hide it, the classic case of being above the law, is the political career of Hillary Clinton. Also, Ted Kennedy literally got away with murder and still sits in the Senate. The Jewish Left protects its own.

Premise: Private Ownership of Property Multiplies Net Quantity of Goods.

Please see chapter 5 of the Second Treatise. It is too long to cite. I will paraphrase a small part of it, but my paraphrase does not do it justice. Locke points out how the ability of humans to use a store of value, such as gold, creates wealth. For example, if a man grew plums, and harvested far more than he could eat, most of them would be wasted. But if he could sell them to many small consumers, in exchange for gold or silver, they would all be consumed, and the seller would still retain the value for the whole harvest. Contrast this to the Marxist goal of abolishing money. All Communist economies contract, or at best, stagnate.

Premise: Nuclear Family is based on Love, Not Fear.

Re: Husband and wife: (Locke's response to a monarchist's contention that the marriage relationship is the prototype for monarchy, as per the Bible)

But there is here no more law to oblige a Woman to such Subjection, if the Circumstances either of her condition or contract with her Husband should exempt her from it...

Or that either of our Queens Mary or Elizabeth, had they married any of their Subjects had been put by thus text into a political Subjection to him? Or that he thereby should have had Monarchical rule over her? God, in this text, give not, that I see any authority to Adam over Eve, or to men over their Wives, but only fortels what should be woman's Lot, how by Providence he would order it so, that she should be subject to her husband, as we see that generally the Law of mankind and customs of nations have ordered it, and there is I grant, a foundation in nature for it. (Ibid. First Treatise: 48–49)

The so-called women's liberation movement is one more front run by the Jewish Left with the intention of further dissolving the glue that holds the country together. The playbook for the women's liberation movement is Engels' book *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and State*. (Engels was Karl Marx' coauthor and colleague.) I cite Engel's work to demonstrate the continuity between the Communist movement and the any number of successor movements co-opted by the Communistic Jewish Left (don't worry; I'm not going to let the nexus between Jews and Communism go unproven. Be patient; the relevant chapters are ahead).

Re: Father and Children:

Nay this power belongs so little to the Father by any peculiar right of Nature, but only as he is guardian of his children, that when he quits his Care of them, he loses his power over them, which goes along with their nourishment and education, to which he is inseparably annexed...his command over his children is but temporary, and reaches not their Life or property. It is but a help to the weakness and imperfection of their Nonage, a discipline necessary to their education. (Ibid. Second Treatise: 65)

Locke shows the great sacrifice fathers (and mothers) make for their children. But all we hear from the Jewish Left and their minions are the evils of patriarchal society. Again, this is taken from the canon of Marxism. Today's Jewish Left is singularly uninventive; all that they propose is taken from Marx and Minions. For them, the canon was closed in 1895 with the death of Frederick Engels, Marx' collaborator.

Re: Inheritance:

Fathers oblige their children to Obedience to themselves, even when they are past Minority, and most commonly too subject them to this or that Political Power. But neither of these by any peculiar right of Fatherhood, but by the reward they have in their hands to inforce and recompense such a Compliance; and is no more power than what a French-man has over an English-man who by hopes of an estate he will leave him, will certainly have a strong Tye on his obedience. (Ibid. Second Treatise: 73)

The Left does not like competition for power. And since money is power, the Left wants a monopoly on it. Therefore it does all it can to confiscate inherited wealth. As we noted, with the money it confiscates from those who produce, it buys the votes of those who do not produce.

Re: Procreation:

For the end of conjunction between Male and Female, being not only procreation, but the continuation of their Species, this conjunction betwixt Male and Female ought to last, even after Procreation, so long as is necessary to the nourishment and support of the young Ones, who are to be sustained by those that got them, till they are able to shift and provide for themselves. This rule, which the infinite wise Maker hath set to the Works of his hands, we find the inferior creatures steadily obey. In those viviparous Animals which feed on grass, the conjunction between Male and Female lasts no longer than the very Act of Copulation...

Wherein one cannot but admire the wisdom of the great Creator, who having given to man foresight and an Ability to lay up for the future, as well as to supply the present necessity, hath made it necessary, that the society of man and Wife should be more lasting, than of Male and Female amongst other Creatures; that so their Industry might be encouraged, and their Interest better united, to make Provision, and lay up goods for their common issue, which uncertain mixture, or easie and frequent solutions of conjugal society [promiscuity] would mightily disturb. (Ibid. Second Treatise: 79-80)

The Left has had forty-plus years to work on the “most vulnerable” of our people. The Negro poor have been the targets of their kind ministrations. What have they bought us? All too many of the Negro young copulate like animals, with no affection. All too often their females get pregnant as soon as menses start. Far too many women have multiple babies from multiple partners, the women frequently being unsure of which male fathered (too generous a term?) which child. They have grandmothers of age thirty, great grandmothers of age 50, all at public expense. I will demonstrate in a future chapter that this is exactly the outcome the Left desires, because it will help dissolve the bonds of citizenship and responsibility that makes society function.

The point/counterpoint laid out above shows basically the two paths available to Western Civilization. We will see how they are followed by different polities in modern history. But more immediately, we will see how religious philosophy can determine the economic and social structure of a nation.

The English colonies of North America developed under the influence of strict Calvinism. Can we trace America’s economic dynamism to Calvinist roots? Where would we be absent that historical accident; or more importantly, what would be the cost to our society of purging its influence? All belief systems change over time. The next chapter will show the step-by-step weakening of the religious traditions under which the nation began its existence.

CHAPTER 19

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND: TIES TO THE NEW WORLD

Since the North American continent turned out to be primarily an English area of settlement, it is helpful to examine English and Scottish religious history as a background for understanding North American Protestantism.

In 1500, England was officially Roman Catholic. There was, however, a strong presence of “Lollards”. The Lollards were a loose collection of proto-protestants who questioned, among other things many of the practices of the existing Church. Among these was the

need for most of the sacraments, such the necessity of priests for hearing confession, and Church ties to Rome. These people presented to Parliament in 1395 a statement of Twelve Conclusions, which summarizes these differences with the Catholic Church. Thus there already existed in England a number of people among whom the ideas of Luther and Calvin would be well-received. The year 1500 saw Henry VIII on the throne of England. He inherited a state in which the power of the nobility to maintain private armies had ended; and, in addition, the beginning of country gentry, “new money,” was beginning to challenge the political supremacy of the old nobility in the shires and countryside. This was a period in which central control was advancing also in France and Spain. The concept of a supra-national power, such as a Church governed from Rome was not consistent with the power of these new national states. Each of these new national powers “domesticated” their respective Churches in different ways. Henry VIII probably thought he was separating from Rome because of a messy divorce; he was actually taking a step that would inevitably have occurred about that time. Lutheran ideas were coming into England; indeed, in Hamlet, Shakespeare makes reference to Wittenberg, the site of a great Lutheran University. Also, English translations of the Bible were being smuggled into England. To a large degree, the invention of the printing press with the associated spread of literacy made the Protestant Reformation inevitable. As in France and Germany, the early Protestants were merchants, skilled tradesman, and prosperous farmers: a middle-class affair.

In 1534, Henry had Parliament pass the Act of Separation, which served to sever the ties of the English Church to Rome. Now, with the nobility stripped of real power, and the English Church in his control, Henry VIII was truly the supreme ruler of England. Similar trends were underway in France and had already been realized in Spain. One of the long-term consequences of the establishment of the Church of England was that the clergy became employees of the state. As we shall see, whenever the clergy become state employees, the soul of the church dies. The same thing happened in France, but it was more indirect, due to the political tension between Rome and Paris, but the last word rested with the French monarch, whatever the appearances.

Henry VIII died in 1547, and a period of regency occurred. Then in 1553, Mary, daughter of Henry’s first (and Catholic) wife became Queen, and made a bloody but futile attempt to re-establish Catholicism as the state religion. At her death, in 1558, Elizabeth I became Queen. Elizabeth was a pragmatist, who wanted peace, stability, and prosperity. To that, the watchword for religious dogma became “adiaphora,” which means in English: “indifferent.” Elizabeth merely wanted to have a general consensus regarding faith, without close questioning of what one believed. Moderation was the aim. But England had many immoderate people, such as Catholics who wanted to restore the Roman Church, and an increasing population of firm Calvinists. The factor that kept these fractious elements under control was a war between England and Spain: in the face of foreign invasion, both Calvinist and Catholic were Englishmen first.

The Spanish king, Phillip II, decided to invade England, and gathered the largest fleet in modern history. In 1588, this fleet reached the English Channel. Following “a tremendous expenditure of powder and shot by both sides with precious little damage done,” a storm blew in. The English fleet went into harbor, and the Spanish fleet was literally blown away. It was blown as far north as Ireland, and proceeded to circle around

the northern shore of Ireland. Most of the boats and crews were lost. Before, during, and after this period, the ideology of John Calvin was making inroads into the Church of England. Simultaneously, the House of Commons was being taken over by the new “gentry” class. Almost as a challenge to the absolutist Tudor state, people were beginning to talk of a Law that transcended the earthly powers. These forces continued to grow. Following the death of Elizabeth, her cousin, James I (1603-1625) became king. His reign almost started out with a bang, as a disgruntled Catholic was caught stacking barrels of gunpowder under Parliament, with the intention of sending both king and Parliament in the direction of heaven. Despite this near-fatal experience, James I continued Elizabeth’s policy of moderation, attempting only “to harry from the land” those who had extreme views.

At James’ death, his son Charles inherited the throne, to become Charles I (1625-49). Charles lacked his father’s ability to compromise, and his wife was a French princess, and a devout Roman Catholic. It is difficult for us to imagine today the hatred Calvinists and Catholics had for each other, but without understanding the power of this hatred, the wars that will presently break out make no sense to the modern reader. Also, at about this time, Dissenters (i.e., extreme Calvinists) were starting to migrate to New England. In 1630, John Winthrop, arrived in Massachusetts. This event starts the most important aspect of the book, and will be picked up in due course. The Church of England at this time was under Calvinist influence. Charles I was suspected of being a “closet Catholic” by many Calvinists. Charles was certainly “high church,” in that he wanted to reinstate the role of ritual in the Church of England. That would have changed the services by making them more like those of Catholicism. But more disturbing to Calvinists was Charles’ appointment of William Laud, in 1633, to be Archbishop of Canterbury. The problem with Laud was that he was an Arminian.

Now, dear reader, if you are typical, you will ask: “What is an Arminian?” I have to confess that prior to writing this book, I didn’t have a clue. We recall that strict Calvinists believe that God knows in advance whom he will save. This is based on His omniscience (knowing all). We humans see events as being past, present, and future. To God is ascribed the quality of being atemporal, or not restricted by time. That is, what has been, is, and will be are equally knowable to Him. So future indeterminacy does not exist for Him. To believe otherwise is to project human limitations on God; a form of anthropomorphism. Belief in strict determinism led some people to despair, and others to feel that since all is predetermined, why bother with good works; nothing one could do could change a predetermined future. The problem every individual Calvinist faced was to know whether or not he was of the “elect,” i.e., the saved. It was felt that God, in a moment of revelation, would vouchsafe to each of His elect knowledge of his having been saved. This almost brutal view of predetermination was softened by a Dutch theologian, Jacobus Arminius (1560-1609). Arminius left a role for human agency to lead to salvation:

The decree of God is, when it concerns His own actions, absolute, but when it concerns man’s conditional, i.e., the decree relative to the savior to be appointed and the salvation to be provided is absolute, but the decree relative to the persons saved or condemned is made to depend on the acts-belief and repentance in the one case, unbelief and impenitence in the other-of the persons themselves.¹

In addition to Arminianism, the Calvinists feared a resurgence of Catholicism. Their fear was aroused because Archbishop Laud reinstated pomp and ceremony into the Church. For many congregants this smacked of “popery.” Laud then went too far by trying to impose a new prayer book upon the Scots, provoking open rebellion against a “popish prayer book.” To make matters even worse, Catholics in Ireland revolted against their non-Catholic overlords. To deal with these rebellions, Charles needed money to raise troops. For this he applied to Parliament for additional tax revenue. Parliament was suspicious that the army might be used against Parliament itself, because Parliament was sharply critical of the religious changes instituted by Laud. Although triggered by a religious question, the crisis soon escalated into a constitutional one. Who has ultimate power in England, Parliament or king? Can the king rule without Parliament? Can the king tax without Parliament’s consent?

These questions led to war between the king and the forces of Parliament; the worst kind of war—civil war. During the chaos of civil unrest and war, Parliament was taken over by the forces of the more extreme Puritan faction of the Calvinist movement. A period marked by civil war began in 1642. It ended in 1649 with the execution of the king, and the installation of a military dictatorship under Oliver Cromwell, who assumed the title of “Lord Protector.” His government was opposed on the right by Catholics and High Church Protestants. On the left there was a collection of agrarian communists (Diggers and Levelers) who wanted to establish a sort of utopian state. There were also religious mystics, who felt they were chosen to inaugurate a new era of the Kingdom of God. Many of these people were armed, and had fought in the civil wars. Fortunately for England, Cromwell was not driven by his own internal demons to be a Caesar, and did not glory in power. Dictatorship had a brief life in Britain.

Now it is time to examine the Puritans’ relationship to Jews. For the Calvinists in general and the Puritans in particular, the Bible was the source of God’s will. For these Protestants, the Bible meant the Old Testament as well as the New. Unlike the Roman Catholic Church, Protestants were not only allowed to read the Bible (in the vernacular), but were expected to read the Bible. Again, it is difficult for us today to relate to a time when the common man was not to be trusted with Biblical text. The best way to limit access to the Bible was to prohibit translations into the vernacular. Having every man become his own ultimate authority on the word of God became the Protestant way, and indicated a trust in man not seen in the Roman Church. But there was a downside to free interpretation: church unity could not be preserved. We will study the result of this loss of a common belief as we trace the ratcheting decay of New England Calvinism to secular humanism. However, that is two centuries in the future. Looking at place-names in the early settlements in New England and Pennsylvania, we see many Biblical place names (Salem, Bethlehem, Canaan, etc.). Also, the first names many of the early settlers gave their children (Obadiah, Nehemiah, etc.) were from the Old Testament. Thus there was much respect manifested for the Old Testament, and by extension, the people of the Old Testament. In England, in 1656, by indirect, almost sleight of hand acts, Cromwell removed the legal impediments to in-migration of Jews:

Cromwell was largely responsible for the readmission of the Jews to England, His puritan views, based largely upon the Old Testament, and his tolerant nature predisposed him to regard the Jews with favor... When it [during discussions at the Whitehall Conference]

became apparent that readmission would only be recommended on the most unfavorable conditions, Cromwell dissolved the conference... [to decide the issue himself] It was expected he would issue a favorable reply... based on his own authority. However, in view of public opinion, Cromwell preferred to adopt an informal arrangement... Cromwell's personal sympathies were manifested in the pension of 100 pounds granted to Manasseh ben Israel. His favorable attitude was so marked that, according to his enemies, Jews regarded him as their messiah.²

The quote above is rich for commentary. It shows that popular opinion was not favorable to Jews. It shows that the goodwill of a benevolent despot was sought and received. It demonstrates yet again the practice of the Jewish community to identify and support such an individual. In this instance the choice worked out well, because Cromwell was an honorable man, and because England is a civilized place. It is easy to find despots; it is hard to find benevolent ones, and, more importantly, to assure that their successors will be benevolent.

Returning to the issue of Calvinism... in order to make the Calvinist position more secure, Parliament passed a law defining the elements of faith of the Church of England. As Parliament was under Calvinist domination (Oliver Cromwell) at this time, the law reflected that fundamentalist influence. The document, called the Westminster Confession, was ratified in 1648. It made official the belief of double determinism, that is, that God determined in advance, who would be saved, and who would be damned. It also postulated the belief in original sin, and the efficacy of Jesus' death on the cross as atonement for original sin. However, His atonement did not gain salvation for all men, but was necessary for the salvation of the elect. God's grace was a pre-requisite for individual salvation. Man could not earn his salvation by good works. (This would be too much like buying an indulgence). The Confession also defined the Bible as the inerrant word of God, and the only document that could take precedence over the Confession itself.³

Calvinism and Capitalism

Kant stated that all rational creatures have to possess some belief system that allows them to make sense of the universe, or existence. An uneducated manual laborer; a petty thief; a chronic alcoholic-those one would think incapable of abstract thought-all must have an organizing view of the universe in order to function as human beings. In those few instances in which human children have been able to survive in the wilderness absent interaction with their own species (feral children), no successful transition to human society has been achieved. The organizing concept for a given human being allows him to integrate all facets of his existence. His religion, his expectations of what society is (ally or enemy), his sense of self-worth, basic feeling of belonging or alienation, all of those intangible attitudes that bridge his connection with the "outside," determine the qualities of these social ties. By qualities I mean such things as confidence, trust, suspicion, ease of maintenance, and purpose. Is the purpose utilitarian? To use another? To achieve a goal for which the other is essential? Is the purpose the pleasure of social interaction in itself? One of the qualities that mediates interaction with others is religion. My working hypothesis here is that one's Weltanschauung (world view) colors all aspects of one's worldly interactions. Therefore, there will, of necessity, be a tie between religious belief and economic behavior.

In Chapter 16 of Part II, I noted the spread of Protestant Christianity in northern Europe, as opposed to the retention of Roman Catholicism in Southern Europe. In most places where Calvinism flourished, there was also a marked growth of industry. This is seen in Scotland, the southern and midland portions of England, and in Holland. With the expulsion of non-Catholics from Spain in 1492, and from France in 1685, Spain and France doomed themselves to an economic stagnation that we see continuing into today. This phenomenon was noticed and explored by Max Weber, a German sociologist. He wrote a seminal book on this topic, entitled *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1920). In this book he makes the premise I noted above regarding the tie between religious belief and economic behavior. Making this correlation was his contribution; I am only building on it. In his work Weber explores those aspects of Calvinist beliefs that serve as a foundation for one's religious beliefs, and further, how they generalize to create a personal value-system that has led to capitalism. These beliefs are thus controlling over what are merely apparently disparate modes of personal engagement with the world.

The aspect of Calvinism that is controlling is that of double determination. Under this condition, the sacraments are useless for salvation. In fact, all "works" are useless for salvation, because participating in the sacraments is a form of work. To presume works to be efficacious is to presume that man has power over God, and can change His will through human agency. Weber calls this "magical thinking." According to this thesis, Catholics, Lutherans, and Anglicans practice "magic," or more properly, credit "magic" as being efficacious. Given this belief system, priests have no meaningful role in salvation. Following this Calvinist belief further, there is no specifically sacred space, place, or time. Instead, all time, space, and place is sacred. Thus everything one does is a sacred action. In this sense, life is a substitute for the sacraments; or more clearly, nothing one does is other than sacramental. One can see that Catholicism and Calvinism are incompatible.

This being the case, one's daily work becomes sacramental. But why do anything if sacraments are useless for salvation? Calvinist belief is that although works are useless for salvation, they are a sign of one's having been chosen by God as one of the elect. Therefore Godly behavior is a sign of election. In daily work, one of the elect could be a shrewd businessman, but he would not cheat. He could buy and sell in any market, but would not countenance corruption or bribery. Fulfillment of duty could be (actually, must be) done in business as well as in any other sphere of human endeavor, because to God, all spheres are the morally equal. To live a monastic life, physically withdrawn from the world, would be a dereliction of duty. In his daily work, the Calvinist maintained an aspect of "worldly asceticism;" in that way he can be in the world, but not of the world. Weber remarks on the loss of spontaneity and joy in the lives of such businessmen.

There are certain sequellae to the above way of life. One of them is not to consume. Whereas dutiful production is a sign of election, conspicuous consumption is a sign of arrogance before God. On the other hand, investment of capital, i.e., "working" capital is desirable. In England, Ireland, and the southern North American colonies, men who became wealthy strove to buy land in order to join the landed aristocracy. This was anathema to Calvinists, because it smacked of the sin of pride. One of the least recognized sequella of the introduction of the capitalist *Weltanschauung* to Western

Europe and North America has been the necessity, over many years, of the development of an accompanying working class, one compatible with increased production. Weber points out that offering more pay to workers who produce more does not automatically lead to greater production. He notes that workers not accustomed to the Western market system simply stop working when they have made enough money to meet their immediate needs:

[Among workers] For not only is a developed sense of responsibility indispensable, but in general also an attitude which, at least during working hours, is freed from continual calculations of how the customary wage may be earned with a maximum of comfort and a minimum of exertion. Labor must, on the contrary, be performed as if it were an absolute end in itself, a calling. But such an attribute is by no means a product of nature. It cannot be evoked by low wages or high ones alone, but can only be the product of a long and arduous process of education. Today, capitalism, once in the saddle, can recruit its laboring force in all industrial countries with comparative ease. In the past this was in every case an extremely difficult problem. And even today it could probably not get along without the support of a powerful ally along the way, which, as we shall see below, was at hand at the time of its development.⁴

In the next paragraphs Weber remarks upon the good labor ethic of the girls from Pietistic backgrounds in Germany in the early 20th century. A comparable situation can be seen with Amish labor in Ohio and Pennsylvania today, which is very highly prized by employers.

(In subsequent chapters I will point out how the Communist Party in general, and the Jewish Left in particular [but I repeat myself], have done everything in their power to destroy this engine of general prosperity. Paradoxically, the old Soviet Union was doing all it could to produce this work ethic. Cuba and North Korea are currently trying to do so.)

Weber also points out the value of education among the New England Protestants, by noting the extraordinary number of the emigrants who had university degrees. We could also note the importance of Harvard College to the early Boston colony. Webber was also perceptive enough to notice the fatal flaw in the culture of the new nation. He remarked upon what he saw, over time, to be a separation of business practice from religious ethics. On his concluding page he writes that “the care for external goods, [which] should lie on the shoulders of the saint like a light cloak, which can be thrown aside any moment, [has now become] an iron cage.”

The Migration of Calvinism to New England

The English settlers who established a colony at Plymouth brought with them a strong Puritan religion. They all wanted to have a strong theological basis for the state. There was no concept, anywhere, in that era, of separation of church and state. They were grateful to God for their deliverance from the un-Godly life in Europe, and for their success in founding “a new Jerusalem.” However, it was only a short time after the colony was first founded in 1620, until the first religious disagreement arose. The problem was to resolve how the various congregations should relate to each other. One model was the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, which gave overall power to a Synod. The other option was to allow each congregation the freedom to establish its own rules

and procedures. A Synod was held at Cambridge, Massachusetts in August, 1648, which decided in favor of allowing each congregation independence. There could be councils and synods, but their powers would be advisory. The net effect was to create “congregational,” as opposed to episcopal, churches. The weakness of this system is that it allows such a wide variance of belief as to risk believing in nothing.

A few years later, a second crucial issue arose. Although they had abandoned most of the Catholic sacraments, they did retain the celebration of the Lord’s Supper. Only full members of the congregation could partake of this sacrament. However, full membership in the congregation was predicated upon having had a credible experience of personal salvation. With the passage of about twenty years, prosperity and population increased, and the parents of the new generation were not certain of the status of the souls of the next generation. To make matters more complicated, full church membership was necessary to be a voting member of the community. Politics and religion met. To solve this problem, the older congregants proposed a status for the next generation. They called it the Half-Way Covenant (1657 and 1662). This was a compromise that would allow the younger generation to vote (they were already paying taxes and fighting Indians), but would deny them Communion until such time as they had individually experienced saving grace. The institution of the Half-Way Covenant effected a change in religion practice by giving partial entry to the congregation of less committed members. It also made a small step in the direction of separation of church and state by reducing the religious requirement as a prerequisite for voting. The expansion of the voting franchise was necessitated by the population dearth. Every available man was needed to fight Indians and to pay taxes. We will see that the need to supply an ever-growing demand for labor has been, and still is, a constant in American history. It may appear that the need for western expansion was the driving force for immigration, but the real driving force was, and still is, a free-market economy that is hungry for labor.

We see how Calvinist Christianity got to North America, and we have seen its first compromise. In following chapters we will trace the continuing series of compromises that eventually will lead to the total loss of faith.

1 Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th ed., s.v. “Arminius.”

2 Encyclopedia Judaica, 1st ed., s.v. “Cromwell”

3 On line: Center for Reformed Theology and Apologetics. www.Reformed.org/index.html

4 Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. by Talcott Parsons (New York:Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1958), 61-62.

CHAPTER 20

IN THE NEW WORLD: CONTINUING RELIGIOUS COMPROMISE

With the passage of time, the people of New England demonstrated less ardor in their religious practices, probably because of a weakening of pure doctrinaire Calvinism. Sermons in the New England Congregational Churches were less inclined to embrace “experiential” religion. The scene was set for a revival. “We capture the meaning of the revival only if we remember that many congregations in New England were stirred from a staid and routine formalism in which experiential faith had been a reality to only a

scattered few.”¹ What is referred to here by “experiential” is the gut feeling of utter depravity of a sinner facing God, followed by the great joy felt on having the inner, personal experience of God’s saving grace. The First Great Awakening was stirred by itinerant preachers such as George Whitefield (1714–1770). There were great outdoor revivals marked by exuberant expressions of faith. The appeal was to emotion, not to the intellect. People who responded to this appeal were referred to as “New Lights.” In contradistinction, those who were suspicious of this emotionalism were called “Old Lights.”² This difference was very important, as it prefigures a split that persists until today. The Old Lights were the more conservative, traditional people. They were well established in business and trades. It soon transpired that the Old Lights became ensconced at Harvard, and one of the Old Lights, Charles Chauncey, wrote a criticism of the emotionalism of the New Lights entitled *Seasonable Thoughts on the State of Religion in New England*. According to Ahlstrom, this became a core document in support of the arising Unitarianism.³ A very important date in American history is 1707. In that year, John Leverett was installed as president of Harvard College. Leverett was one of the Old Lights who belonged to the Boston merchant aristocracy which had been finding the old religion incompatible with its growing international trade. We see here the emergence of an intellectualism. It had already been demonstrated in 1699 when Leverett and others liberalized the Brattle Street Church by removing the Half-Way Covenant as a bar to full church membership. Full membership was open to all, regardless of state of grace. Thus we see the beginning of the New England merchant class becoming the New England aristocracy. Attendance at Harvard College became a necessary rite of passage for the sons of this new elite. Hence it was only a matter of time for Harvard to necessarily become Unitarian. Although Harvard was “essentially and conscientiously” Unitarian by 1820,⁴ it had been a bastion of liberalism for a century. Boston and Harvard looked to the European Enlightenment as their intellectual mentor. As their bodies went west, their eyes went east. Some things don’t change.⁵

As we mark the course of the Old Lights, we will see that they make a step-by-step transition from extreme Calvinism to modified Calvinism. From there they progress to Unitarianism by the early 18th century. Slowly they make their way, via the Social Gospel of the mid 19th century to a sort of Transcendentalism on the one hand, and a formal, moralistic religious piety (but without a sense of divine presence), on the other. From there these two streams come together again as secular humanism, and finally, in the 20th century, as “religious” Socialism.

By 1800, the First Great Awakening has been played out. The American Revolution had occurred, and a new nation had come into existence. Under these changed circumstances, a Second Great Awakening occurred. Although similar in many respects, there is one key difference. The Second GA emphasized human efforts as the agency for improvement in order to be of help in God’s plan for redemption. This element had been absent in the First Great Awakening. As in the First Great Awakening, the Second was marked by emotional responses to being touched by the Holy Spirit. This undignified behavior was again viewed with contempt by the Old Lights and the growing Unitarian movement. But there was something useful to the Old Lights in the Second Great Awakening. Out of the

desire to prepare for God's kingdom grew movements such as temperance, prison reform, better care for mentally ill, and increasingly, abolition of slavery.

Before going further into the consequences of the Second GA, this is a good point at which to examine a "manifesto" of Unitarianism as it was in the early years of the 19th century. On the occasion of the induction of a new Unitarian minister to The First Unitarian Church of Baltimore (May 5, 1819), a clergyman named William Ellery Channing delivered an address which serves as a key document in the history of the Unitarian Church. Since this ideology was the dominant ideology of the powerful Boston mercantile elite, it deserves some attention. But first, who was Channing? He was, of course, a Harvard graduate. He became a minister, whose interests lay in promoting the major social reform movements of the era (noted above). Traditional Christianity could not be deconstructed in one step. Deftly disposing of the Old Testament ("The dispensation of Moses...we consider as adapted to the childhood of the human race")⁶, all that remains is to in some way "neutralize" the New Testament. This he accomplishes by noting that we must take into account the era in which it was written and appropriately transpose its meaning to our times. In addition, we must bear in mind that the writers of the New Testament were flawed human beings and that their flawed understanding has to have been transferred to their transcription of God's Word. In addition, we are to interpret Scripture in accord with contemporary human reason. By the time his twenty-page sermon⁷ is concluded, we see Scripture reduced to a spiritual Rorschach test that will mean whatever you want it to mean at the time you are reading it. Tomorrow it may mean something else.

At the beginning of the 19th century, the Unitarian Churches were the spearhead in the movement that ultimately would lead to the destruction of Christianity. But man does not live by bread alone, and as Kant pointed out, man needs some spiritual anchor. Since "scientific Socialism" had not yet been revealed to mankind, something else had to fill the gap. The filler was Transcendentalism. Here we have the first evidence of the baleful influence of Germany on the U.S. In the period from 1819 to the Civil War, the transcendental movement flourished in New England among the scions of the Boston elite:

If fresh influences had not come in from abroad, American religion and especially the later forms of Puritanism would have stewed much longer in their own juices. For this reason one can ascribe more than symbolic significance to the decision of four gifted New Englanders to pursue advanced studies at Göttingen University. Every one of these students returned to the America as at least a temporary apostle for those aspects of German intellectual life that had impressed him most. In their train came two accomplished German scholars to the Harvard faculty. In the meantime many men, both orthodox and Unitarian, were improving their linguistic equipment in growing recognition of German scholarship, while others, in mounting numbers, followed the pattern of study in Germany.⁸

As to what this transcendentalism actually was, I can only say it consisted of a mixture of half-digested Kant, with a sprinkling of British and Continental Romanticism. Added to that was a dollop of garden-variety mysticism. They also give us our earliest report on the death of God.⁹ I will not waste our joint time in further exploration of this fluff. The interested reader is free to pursue it on his own time.

Social Gospel

Social Gospel consists of two words, one secular and one sacred. This is thus an appropriate phrase for an intersection. In the U.S., we have not allowed a government-sponsored church, and as a result, our churches are far stronger than those that have been or still are government supported. Examples are the weakness of religion in the life of the French, English, and Germans. For most of these EU citizens, God is dead. In the U.S., because the church is separate from the state, religious feeling has not suffered the consequences of being a branch of the state. In the early 19th century, the New England Protestant elite decided to use God to render unto Caesar the power to “fix” society. All abuses, real and imagined, were fair game. This was not such a stretch for the Puritans, because the Blue Laws mandating the sanctity of the Sabbath went back to the 17th century. The concept that a person might not be liable to civil penalties for such offenses as violating the Sabbath would have appeared alien and dangerous to them. It still does, as the augmented penalties for hate crimes are but a modern iteration of the moral crusade under a new guise. It is much easier to recognize the danger of using religious moral fervor to support interference in civil law when one considers the situation in Moslem countries in which the attempts are currently being made to apply Islamic law as a part of the civil code.

The religious motivation impelling the Protestant elite to create a nanny state is clearly stated by Timothy Smith:

The Calvinist Idea of foreordination, rejected as far as it concerned individuals, was now transferred to a grander object—the manifest destiny of a Christianized America. Men in all walks of life believed that the sovereign Holy Spirit was endowing the nation with the resources sufficient to convert and civilize the globe, to purge human society of all its evils, and to usher in Christ’s reign on earth. Religious doctrines which Paine, in his book *The Age of Reason*, had discarded as the tattered vestment of an outworn aristocracy became the wedding garb of a democratized church, bent on preparing men and in situations for a kind of proletarian marriage supper of the Lamb.¹⁰

The social gospel is alive and well today. In fact, in the mainline Protestant churches, in which God is either dead or on life support, the promotion of social causes is all that remains. If you go to a United Church of Christ on a Sunday and a meeting of a Socialist party on Monday, the only way to tell the difference would be to consult the calendar. If a fellow parishioner had left his umbrella in Church on Sunday, you could return it to him on Monday. Some of the recent and present causes supported by the mainline Protestant churches have been forced bussing for racial balance and Section Eight Housing. These reforms allow the white working class equal access to such benefits as drugs, midnight basketball, and stray bullets. (Note that the liberals who give us such legislation are generous enough to allow the working class to have all these benefits and more! The liberals have taken it upon themselves to live in such depressing compounds such as Hyannis port. Inexplicably, they have been too modest to publicize their sacrifices.)

You might think that since these churches support gay marriage and giving condoms out in junior high school, that they would have nothing to say regarding man’s sinful nature. But rest easy! They have not lost the moral indignation of their forefathers. Not one bit! They rightfully castigate us for our sins: racism, sexism, homophobia, and classism. They

remind us that we are also responsible for the children starving in Asia, global warming, and sunspots. In fact, if you ask them of which social sin we are not guilty, they are unable to come up with any. Just like their forebears, they consider us thoroughly depraved. However, since all sin is social, grace is unnecessary. We can be saved by works alone: from each according to his means, to each according to his needs. How do they know it's true? Marx has told them so.

They have come full circle from belief in God to belief in themselves-as-God. God is not dead; he has been fired.

These latter-day Puritans know themselves to be possessed of wisdom far in excess of that of the common people. They have been accused of arrogance, but how can it be arrogance if it is true? They are doing the best they can to enlighten the masses. They have organizations such as The National Education Association, the Carnegie Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the McArthur Foundation, and various United Way groups, just to name a few. They devote enormous amounts of time and money to these organizations in order to rescue the common people from such delusions as sexism, racism, classism, and homophobia (scrh). The only thing that puzzles them is that their churches are losing congregants to churches that actually maintain a clear difference between right and wrong. This loss of congregants serves to confirm the stupidity of the common people.

Communitarian Movement

There is a circumstance under which Communistic communities have and do exist. Monasteries in the Roman Catholic Church and in the Eastern Orthodox rite have existed for centuries. In the U.S., during the early and middle parts of the 19th century, Shaker communities arose. Other than Catholic monastic institutions, these were the most well-known American examples of Communistic existence. However, the numbers were small, and the movement died out. Secular attempts at Communistic living began in 1824, when Robert Owen, a Scottish industrialist, established a short-lived community at New Lanark, Indiana. There were others; they all failed. "All of this secular community's failure was almost certain when its participants lacked the intense religious commitment which could repress the individual inclinations and render paternalism agreeable."¹

In addition to having religious base, the other reason for the success of Communistic enterprises is the voluntary nature of the groups. Unlike Socialism and Communism as a political movement, there was no attempt to force a system on unwilling people. In the secular world, the institution of collectivism can only be accomplished at the point of a bayonet.

1 Sydney Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People*. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1973), 287.

2 *Ibid.*, 228.

3 *Ibid.*, 288.

4 *Ibid.*, 398.

5 *Ibid.*, 349–352.

6 <http://www.transcendentalists.com/Unitarian-christianity.htm>

7 Ibid.

8 Ahlstrom, 599.

9 Ibid., 603.

10 Ibid., 638.

11 Ibid., 498.

Chapter 21

OTHER

This chapter will delve into the philosophy underlying Communism. I will try to present the Communist response to life stress starting from the most abstract level possible.

The crystal is an organized mass of matter. It is based on a predictable, repeating pattern of atomic or molecular structure. Based on its uniformity, it tends to be at a low thermodynamic energy state. Compare this with the cell. The cell is living: it can grow, repair itself, and reproduce. Its thermodynamic energy is far greater than that of the crystal. It is further differentiated from the crystal by its drive toward life. Let us proceed from the single-cell life form to multicellular organisms. At the level of the organism, this life drive is even more pronounced. Try to kill an insect: —it will do everything it can to preserve its life. No nonliving substance will do that.

Some species of living creatures form societies. One of the simpler societies is that of the ant colony. As a society it demonstrates the same ability to grow, reproduce, and self-repair that we have seen in the cell. The individual ant, as well as the colony, will also fight to live. Some specialized ants live to fight. What is lacking here is innovation. The behavior of its members is stereotyped. Ant society does not appear to produce poets.

However interesting Hymenopteric poets might be, our concern is with human society. The essence of the motivating force for human behavior is based on the same elemental force of self-interest first manifest in single-celled organisms. This is not to deny either the myriad forms sublimated self-interest can take, nor to deny the evolution of altruistic behavior. These higher-level forms of behavior are nonetheless derivatives of the elemental drive. No nonliving matter can be altruistic.

It is the self-interested behavior of individual humans that has led to society as we know it. Self-interest leads to innovation. Innovation is lacking in ant colonies and the human equivalents. In Communist societies, there is no reward for innovation, so it does not occur. If one word could be used to define Communist society, it would be conservative. As a result, production of goods and services over time does not increase. Such societies are, at best, zero-sum affairs.

The driving force of self-interest cannot be abolished in living things without destroying life. But human society can make laws that will limit the venues and degree to which an individual may act in his own self-interest. From this derive the legal codes of all societies. In free-market societies, expression of the basic drive (within the law) is called initiative. There are also instances of such initiative in organized crime—we call this criminal conspiracy. The motive force is the same. One of the chief determinants as to

whether a manifestation of drive is labeled “initiative” or “criminal” is the legal parameter set by a given society.

Numerous examples can be had. One good example is the provision of medical care in the former USSR. Medical care was a “right,” and as such was available to all Soviet citizens. Doctors were paid by the state and could not bill patients. The salary levels set for doctors were so low that doctors had to moonlight doing other jobs. Taxi drivers made more than doctors. Because of this situation, doctors routinely expected bribes from patients. Absent these bribes, patients would receive care below the level customary to the time and place. In a market system, such as the private sector, in which a physician can set his fee, the result is roughly the same, but whereas in the first instance the payment is called a ‘bribe,’ in the second it is “fair market value.” In some countries, especially in Asia and South America, service employees, including government employees, are paid so poorly that absent bribes, they could not subsist. Everyone knows this, and no government that made a serious attempt at ending baksheesh would even be contemplated, let alone come into office.

Some years ago I experienced an example of the lack of initiative native to Socialism. I was working as a physician at a governmental agency. At that site, the patient records were still paper and frequently got lost. Finding the records doesn’t always solve the problem, because doctors’ handwritten notes are typically hard to read. Also, medication lists may be outdated, and lab work may be hard to find. I mentioned this to a mid level administrator. She acknowledged that going to computerized records would be cheaper in the long run and also make for better patient care immediately. But, she said, that even if she could prove that the change would be cost-effective in the long run, the higher-ups don’t care. They are salaried also, so why should they bother? Then she stated that she is not really concerned, because she also is salaried and will gain nothing by advocating for change.

Can self-interest be suppressed? No, because self-interest is an integral part of human nature. When suppressed by law, it shows itself in the form of a perversion. The frustrated form of self-interest is corruption. One way or another, the human drive for life will out.

The drive for life, defined above, is the motive force in evolution. Those species most competent to deal with their environment, flourish. A key part of species survival is the ability of organisms to adapt to changing environmental conditions. Sometimes too much of a good thing is fatal: a species too perfectly adapted to its environment may die out in the face of even moderate change in climate or fauna. This is a case of overspecialization, in which successful adaptation has led to rigidity. The downside to random genetic change is disease or maladaptation. But that is the price living organisms must pay, because random genetic drift is also the source of heritable advantage. This genetic innovation is neutral in itself; it is useful or harmful to any given creature only in relation to the environmental challenges unique to that creature. However, absent this genetic innovation, life would cease to exist.

I think that I have established that common to any living organism is a drive for survival. Further, the means for achieving survival is the ability to change.

Returning momentarily from the species to the individual, we learn something valuable from immunology and neuroscience. In order to be immunocompetent, an individual must have had much experience fighting off bacterial and viral invaders.¹ An environment free of microbial challenge is fatal to the individual. Similarly, in the development of the nervous system, the developing human will not have a fully functional nervous system, absent challenge.² It is common knowledge that muscular development and coordination in athletes will not develop without challenge.

Individuals also require challenge for adequate social and psychological development. We will go back to hoary sources to demonstrate this. GWF Hegel, a German philosopher of the early nineteenth century, wrote *The Phenomenology of Spirit* in 1806. In the section titled “Lordship and Bondage,” Hegel postulates that a human being can only attain full self-consciousness as a result of a serious (even life-threatening) confrontation with another self-conscious being.³ Freud postulates something similar in his theory of the Oedipal event. He states that one of the requirements for the psychological health in the adult is the successful resolution of the Oedipal conflict as a child.⁴

Do we as a society, as well as individuals, require challenge? I believe that individuals will not mature into healthy adults in the absence of challenge. What about society? Here we come to Karl Marx. He accepts the presence of conflict in human society, but states that the conflict seen in society is not random. It serves to drive society to a given preordained endpoint. This progression undoes the historical layers of pre-Communist (i.e., feudal and capitalist) society. Specifying these layers, Marx and Engels speak of the initial subjection of women by man; they speak of race and class oppression. However, this oppression was not in vain, since the conflicts generated by these tensions provide the necessary preconditions for the endpoint of the eventual utopia. Hence these necessarily sequential conflicts cannot be shirked since the evolution of scientific Socialism follows a particular and necessary order, called historical materialism. They inform us that the penultimate stage is the “dictatorship of the proletariat.” After that, our prophets inform us, “the state will wither away,” heralding the millennium of profane utopian Socialism.

If anything that Marx has said should give us pause, it is this last statement. It gives us assurance that the dictators will be wise enough to know when to relinquish power and virtuous enough to actually do so. How long can you hold your breath?

The other assumption is tacit. It presumes that human history has an endpoint, and then will stop. By the stoppage of history Marx envisages a society free of major conflict. The major conflict in question almost always involves the production and distribution of goods and services. Does any sane person actually believe that such an utopian society, a society without law and social organization, can really exist? Although he doesn’t address the issue, Marx’s utopia also requires a technological arrest, such that the means of production will be frozen in time to the moment of the revolution.

It has been observed by many archeologists that technological change destabilizes society.⁵ In a utopia, there will be no impetus to innovate; on the contrary, vested interests will exert a strong and continuous force in favor of the status quo. The advances in transportation, manufacturing, and medicine that we have seen in the West since 1860 to the present would have been stillborn in a Marxist utopia. Communist (utopian) society

cannot survive in the face of change. The stark reality is that Marx's utopian plans, if carried out, would have to produce either anarchy or tyranny. Since anarchy doesn't last long, it would necessarily have to be followed by tyranny. Men have always chosen tyranny over anarchy, given only those two options.

But mankind is not limited to these two options. As I have shown (chapters 18 and 19) England and the U.S. have evolved stable democracies in the absence of either extreme. I concede that these governments evolved over time and with much effort. They are "high maintenance" affairs. But they do present an alternative to anarchy and tyranny.

In the face of viable alternatives, and because of the inherent fairy-tale "happily ever after" aspect of Marxism, I wonder at its appeal. A large part of Eastern Europe and Asia have been intoxicated by this witches' brew. Many Western intellectuals have similarly been beguiled. It is beyond the scope of this book to explore that issue.

An issue that we can explore will close this chapter. That is the connection between the "other" and the Jewish Left. Marx, the apostate Jew-hating Jew, harbored in his core the very essence of Diaspora Judaism: Fear. His whole theory is an elaborate fantasy in which he could create a society in which there is no "other." Only in such a society, marked by unending sameness, could the frightened Jew be indistinguishable from everyone else. No more pogroms, no more expulsions, no more punitive taxation, no more accusations of being a Christ-killer, no more discrimination in job selection, no more restrictions to ghettos...no more other.

1 Charles A. Janeway, et al., *Immunobiology: The Immune System in Health and Disease* (London: Elsevier, 1999), Part IV: The Adaptive Immune Response.

2 John Nolte, *The Human Brain: An Introduction to Functional Anatomy* (St. Louis: Mosby, 1999), 420.

3 GWF Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit* trans. by AV Miller (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 111–119.

4 James Strachey, et al, *The Standard Edition of the Complete Works of Sigmund Freud* (London: Hogarth Press, 1975), vol. XVI, 332–338.

5 Michael A. Hoffman, *Egypt Before the Pharaohs* (New York: Dorset Press, 1979), 98–99.

CHAPTER 22

BENEVOLENT DESPOTS

Liberty

This chapter will deal with the concept of "benevolent despot" by studying the reigns of two eighteenth-century autocrats: Frederick the Great of Prussia (1712–1786) and Joseph II (1741–1790), Emperor of Austria. Before delving into the details of their individual lives, I will define two terms: (1) liberty and (2) legitimate prince.

I divide liberty into two types, following Montesquieu: First, political liberty: "as in a country of liberty, every man who is supposed a free agent ought to be his own governor; the legislative power should reside in the whole body of the people."¹ Thus political liberty consists of participating in making the laws of the nation. There is another kind of

“liberty,” particularly spoken of in the U.S. today. The word liberty is not usually attached to it: rather it is called civil rights, economic freedom, equity, justice or economic justice, or fairness. I will call it civil liberty, consistent with the most common usage in the U.S. today. Our liberal politicians do not like the word liberty, but are very comfortable with civil rights. That should be our clue to pay close attention to what civil rights means. Having civil rights does not necessarily mean having political liberty. Political liberty, as noted above, allows all citizens to have a say in legislation. Civil rights say nothing about citizen participation in making laws. A civil right could relate to universal access to “free” medical care or guaranteed employment or the right to a “free” education. It could be the right to ride in the front of the bus. It in no way guarantees the citizen the right to shape legislation. The most oppressive dictatorships of the past, such as Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany, gave their citizens many, if not all, of these civil rights listed in the sentence above. Today, in North Korea and Cuba, I assume the average citizen also has the civil rights mentioned above, to the extent that the economies of these dynamic workers’ paradises are able to supply them. If these polities are performing true to form, each individual citizen has an equal share in less and less, as the national economies of these statist regimes continue to contract. (It must be noted that corruption is inherent in all secular Communist societies, and that corruption, per se, reduces productivity. (See chapters 21 and 26 re. corruption/Communist link).

It is because of the failure of voters to distinguish the difference between civil and political liberty that the Left is able to maintain its pose as champion of freedom as it continues to cut away at political liberty. The confusion is intentional.

Legitimate Prince

In the context of European history, I define legitimate prince to be an autocrat from an established tradition of rulership that has been in place for a long time. By this I mean an autocracy that has coexisted with its subjects long enough for the Princely (used in a generic sense for the ruler) government to have gained a sense of acceptance by the people. It has been present long enough for traditions to have accumulated about it and to have acquired a popular sense of being necessary for the well-being of the people and the security of the state from foreign threats. Usually it has become an hereditary monarchy, and over the decades and centuries, a nobility and/or civil and administrative service has developed. In addition, there has always been a religious establishment, such as the Roman Catholic Church in France or the Ulema (Islamic religious council) in the Ottoman Empire. The institutional strength of the rulership is strong enough to tolerate not only the transition of kingship from father to son (or daughter), but also the transition from one dynasty to the next.

In contrast to the legitimate Prince, there is the dictator or tyrant. (I do not mean to draw an absolute line by this distinction between Prince and dictator. Legitimate princes can become tyrants, and a tyrant can be the beginning of a dynasty of eventual princes.) In general, tyrants are first-generation rulers and do not have in place the traditional balancing forces noted above in the case of a “legitimate prince.” They have not developed a sense of limit to their authority, which makes those about them also uncertain as to the limits of autocratic authority. Tyrants frequently turn on their own supporters due to real or imagined conspiracies. Because of the above, tyrants are known

to be exceptionally cruel. Some examples from ancient history are the Roman Emperors Nero, Caligula, and Commodus. A recent example is Saddam Hussein.

Tyrants behave toward the outside world in a similarly self-defeating manner. Unable to compromise, tyrants go for all or nothing. Two examples are Napoleon and Hitler. After 1812, Napoleon could have compromised with the powers of Europe by giving up any claim to territory outside France. The existing monarchs of Europe would have accepted him as ruler of France. But Napoleon was so insecure due to his own lack of royal lineage, that he could not accept half a loaf.² A more recent example is Hitler. He could have stopped after the Munich agreement, but proceeded to engage in a suicidal two-front war.

Absolute power has its dark side. Along with absolute power come the gnawing forces of fear and personal inadequacy. This combination of power and fear is almost always fatal to both ruler and ruled. I do not think any but the strongest personality can resist the horrifying mental strain of absolute power. There have been in history very few absolute rulers who were not destroyed by absolute power.

Benevolent Despot in Prussia: Frederick the Great

In 1740, Frederick, Crown Prince of Prussia, became King of Prussia, with the name Frederick II (b. 1712, d. 1786). History would come to refer to him as Frederick the Great. Prussia, at that time, was the largest of a number of small north German states. It was to be the kernel of the eventual modern Germany. Frederick introduced Prussia to Europe as a power that could not be ignored in any consideration of international affairs.

By way of introducing Frederick, I will start by giving a quote from Carl Gottlieb Svarez, tutor to Frederick's son. From what we know of Frederick, there is no reason to doubt the accuracy of these words:

The most regular order in the whole constitution of the state; the strictest supervision of the prompt and impartial administration of justice; the ever-alert precaution against one estate or class of the nation impairing the rights of the others so that the poorer and lower is not oppressed by his rich and powerful fellow-citizens; the undiminished care for the foundation and support of public institutions whereby the prosperity of the individual is furthered and agriculture, manufactures and factories benefit; the regard for civil liberty; for the rights and possessions of the subjects; and finally, the most complete religious and intellectual freedom—these are the fundamental pillars of the administration of the Prussian state.³

Frederick lived a Spartan personal life—"The king dressed in a threadbare uniform at all times"⁴—with little concern for rank or ceremonies. Accordingly, he did little if anything in the way of personal glorification. As a result of his work and that of his father, Frederick William I, "the state had been made independent of the sovereign: the 'King of Prussia' was a permanent institution above the king as a person."⁵ It could be said with accuracy that Frederick was more the first servant of the state than its master.

The information above gives a general impression of the atmosphere in the Prussian court at the time of Frederick the Great. Now to the particulars. As we view these particulars, we will note that they seek to create a removal of barriers of social class and rank in the interest of national unity. In regard to religion, he stated, "All religions must be tolerated.

The Fiscal shall only keep an eye open lest one encroaches on the other, for here everyone must be allowed to choose his own road to salvation.”⁶ His reason for advocating religious toleration may not have had very much to do with salvation. “Sects were tolerated and churches built for them, as long as they made no claim to a special provision within the state. In the interests of religious peace controversial sermons and any form of heresy hunting were forbidden. The “ultimate purpose of all state regulations on religious matters was the preservation of state unity. The state claimed and obtained supremacy over the churches.”⁷ I italicized the sentence. The purpose of religious toleration was to preserve state unity. At first glance this appears to be reasonable. But the motivation to preserve state unity is impeachable, as it is not the noble motivation for religious freedom as a value in itself. It makes the interest of the state the criteria upon which a policy is judged to be good or bad.

The next part of the phrase says, “The state claimed and obtained supremacy over the churches.” The problem of a state church is not that it uses public funds to function, but that public funds poison the recipient. None of the state churches of Europe (Germany, Scandinavia) have any vibrancy. Nietzsche said, “God is dead.” He should have said, “The church is dead,” poisoned by state support. In the end, state support means state control. A further example of the ulterior motive for religious tolerance is seen in regard to the Jesuits, whose order was abolished by papal brief in 1773. “The order was not published in Prussia, and Bishop Strachwitz of Breslau was instructed to extend his protection to the Jesuits in the exercise of all their religious functions. Their scientific and pedagogical approach to teaching made them irreplaceable in Silesia and West Prussia...Tolerance and *raison d'état* mingled in the royal decree of 1776 ordering the Jesuits to change their name to that of Members of the Royal School Institute.”⁸ I think *raison d'état* trumped tolerance.

Frederick's attitude toward Jews, not surprisingly, was also based on *raison d'état*. “Not only do the principles of law and order demand that we protect the Privileged Jews; but the common good, especially as manifested in the preservation and development of industries, do so as well.”⁹ I must point out here that tolerance for Jews was extended only to those Jews who were specifically licensed by the state to live in Prussia. This licensure was extended to “protected Jews” (*Schutzjude*). The cost was 1,000 thalers per head, and for a long time, the Jewish community had to assume responsibility for any crimes that might be committed by their individual members. Jews were beginning to be commercially and administratively valuable. In 1754 some royal mints were leased to Jews.¹⁰ Again, we see that tolerance was predicated upon its usefulness to the state. Missing is recognition of tolerance as a quality to be valued as a thing in itself.

Frederick was the first great leveler in Prussian society. Since the chief good in Prussia was to be a dependable cog in the wheel of state, much of what follows can be seen to support that end. Taxes were extended to all; the nobility and clergy lost their former exemption from taxation: “The exemption from taxation previously enjoyed by the nobility and clergy was abolished: Frederick held that, since the state extended its protection to all subjects, all should contribute to its expenses; even the royal domains were liable to tax.”¹¹ He also eliminated the local Estates, that is, local councils in various parts of the realm that had rights and privileges dating back to the Middle Ages.¹² Everyone was to be the same under the law. A famous instance in which

Frederick himself was subject to the law was the windmill incident. Frederick had built himself a palace in Potsdam which he called Sans Souci. Right in the middle of the palace grounds was an old windmill, worked by a miller, the son and grandson of a miller. He refused to sell the windmill to Frederick; Frederick did not use any legal tricks to force sale. One can still see the working windmill in drawings and paintings of the completed palace grounds. The king did not consider himself above the law. I do not know the rest of the story regarding the windmill. For all I know it could still be there.

The state was also the force behind industrial expansion, providing capital, monopoly rights, and protective trade barriers to help new industry.¹³ During his reign, the state added self-sufficiency in capital goods production, in addition to the preexisting agricultural self-sufficiency. In addition, after Prussia received territory to her east as a result of conquest, Frederick used the state finances to obtain settlers for the area, by having homes and churches built at government expense.¹⁴

In 1780, Reichsfreiherr vom Stein wrote a succinct description of Prussia under Frederick II:

Everything was done by autocracy, there was no Estates constitution and no active state council to give unifying force; there were no institutions in which a community spirit, a comprehensive view and fixed administrative maxims could develop. Every activity awaited initiative from above, independence and self-confidence were lacking...As long as a great man was at the head of the state, guiding it with spirit, strength, and uniformity, the system produced good and brilliant results..."¹⁵ That Frederick was a good man as well as a "Great" man is certain. One need only refer to his feeling statement regarding the poor: "Keep in mind the condition of the poor; for he [the prince] must imagine himself in the situation of a peasant or industrial worker and ask himself: if I had been born into the social class, where one's hands are one's sole asset, what would I expect from the sovereign? Whatever his common sense tells him ought to be done, that he must do."¹⁶

But what would happen when the power of this centralized state falls into the hands of a man far less noble than Frederick? What happens when the time comes that "Pharaoh no longer knows Joseph"?

Now we will discuss a man who rivaled Frederick in power, and, in fact was his chief enemy on the battlefield and halls of diplomacy. While he may have rivaled Frederick in power politics, he was very similar to Frederick in his political philosophy. We will now explore the policies of Joseph II, Emperor of Austria.

Benevolent Despot in Austria: Joseph II

I will begin with a general statement by Joseph II (b. 1741, d. 1790) while he was still Crown Prince. It foreshadows the sort of social order toward which he would strive during his reign: "Religious toleration, a mild censorship, no prosecution for morals, and no espionage in private affairs, should be the maxim of the government. Industry and commerce are to be promoted through the prohibition of all foreign goods, except spices, through the abolition of monopolies, the establishment of commercial schools, and the destruction of the principle that the pursuit of business is incompatible with aristocracy. The idea of misalliance should cease."¹⁷

Now for specifics. The most revolutionary attitudes and actions of Joseph II were those regarding the Catholic Church. Like Frederick II, Joseph was anticlerical and wanted to eliminate religion as a divisive force in his kingdom. Like Frederick II, Joseph sought to encourage toleration. The other approach, practiced in France, Spain, and the Italian states, was to make Roman Catholicism the only tolerated religion. That approach was a manifest failure, as evidenced by the moribund economies of those states, as well as the out-migration of very valuable workers and entrepreneurs from those states. The German states, England, Prussia, and the new North American colonies were the beneficiaries of these out-migrations of Protestants and Jews. The religious fanaticism of the Roman Church of his day was repulsive to Joseph:

Fanaticism shall in future be known in my states only by the contempt I have for it; nobody shall any longer be exposed to hardships on account of his creed; no man shall be compelled in future to profess the religion of the state, if it be contrary to his persuasion and if he have other ideas of the right way of insuring blessedness. In future my empire shall not be the scene of abominable intolerance...Tolerance is an effect of that beneficent increase of knowledge which now enlightens Europe, and which is owing to philosophy and the efforts of great men; it is a convincing proof of the improvement of the human mind, which has boldly reopened a road through the dominions of superstition, which was trodden centuries ago by Zoroaster and Confucius, and which, fortunately for mankind, has now become the highway of monarchs.”¹⁸

Saul Padover clearly states how the Emperor viewed the relationship of Church to State:

This gives a pretty good idea of what the Roman Catholic clergy could expect from their new ruler. They were not to be disappointed. The background of his thinking came from Professors Anton von Martini and Joseph von Sonnenfels, the latter a Jewish apostate. The term for their premise was *jura majestatica circa sacra*. This means that secular authorities hold supremacy over church authorities. Thus if there were a conflict between state and canon law, state law would prevail. Other princes adhered to this principle, but were not so public about it.¹⁹ To make matters even worse, bishops were required to swear loyalty to the state, civil marriage was made legal, and anyone who pleased was permitted to read the Bible. The only reason Joseph did not secularize the school system is because there were not enough trained lay teachers. Almost the worst thing Joseph did was to publish an Act of Tolerance, granting all Christians and Jews religious tolerance.²⁰

In order to discourage papal action against him, Joseph II borrowed a ploy from the French. Whenever the French monarchy did something that displeased Rome (such as imprisoning a pope), the French used their “sacred weapon” against Rome. This weapon was the threat to convene a General Council of Catholic clerics (of which many were French), which could then be used to overrule the pope. (The dogma of papal supremacy was not accepted until 1871.) Joseph II made clear that he had no qualms about using the “sacred weapon.”²¹

It was bad enough that Joseph copied the French; at least they were nominal Catholics. But Joseph also took a page from that heretic Henry VIII of England and shut down the monasteries. That action provided the state with an enormous amount of real estate; three-eighths of the land in Austria had been owned by the Church.²² Joseph reimbursed

the Church in the same manner as Henry VIII had, i.e., not at all. Needless to say, the Church was hostile to Joseph (or at least as hostile as it could be within the bounds of political reality). Joseph II had a great sense of sarcasm: when the Archbishop of Cologne remonstrated against Joseph for letting anyone own and read the Bible, Joseph responded:

Had I not studied people sufficiently to realize that only few read, and that even less understand what they have read, and that only a slight number make use of their reading [sic]. I am even acquainted with some who do not know what they write. With such creatures prohibition of books is more to be feared than bad publications; for the former make possible the reading of the latter. Without the unfortunate prohibition, we would still be promenading naked in the earthly paradise and would never have had the chance to discuss these important matters raised by Your Electoral Highness.²³

Joseph was equally radical as far as social status within Austria. He annulled all legal immunities relating to legal status, and on several occasions noblemen were chained to others criminals on a street-cleaning crew.²⁴ Not surprisingly, this did not go over well with the nobility, and a noble lady complained to Joseph's mother (Maria Theresa) about this practice. The practice continued.

As far as state intervention in the lives of the people, the Austrian state might well qualify for the honor of being the first nanny state. Even Hillary was to be outclassed by Joseph II:

With or without aid and co-operation, the absolutist monarch instituted a regular "paper regime". Edict followed edict with lightening rapidity. At the end of his ten year reign there were six thousand decrees, and over eleven hundred and forty-seven folio pages. Every conceivable and inconceivable matter was regulated, rearranged, and prescribed. The emperor was trying to create a rational, mechanized state, soulless and will-less, but one that should function like a well-greased machine. The thoroughness with which he went to work on this monster, which he called the State, is appalling. Nothing was left to chance, imagination, or initiative. He meant well, of course. His people were to be made happy in spite of themselves. He was to be to them a father, a harsh and brooding, but just and solicitous father.²⁵

In my description above of both rulers I have tried to present the sort of polity each created. In addition, I have intentionally tried to give a portrait of each as a specific personality. The personality of an autocrat is of vital importance because there is so much power at his disposal. Thus the impact of his decisions has a great impact on the role the state plays in domestic and international politics. In the case of Prussia and Austria, we see the evolution of the state as machine, such that it will be usable by whoever is the ruler. The power is vested in the office of the ruler, to be used or abused at his will.

What does this state of political structure mean for Jews? I believe it provides the sort of state in which lapsed and lapsing Jews feel safest, and which they strive to replicate wherever they live. As noted at many times in the history of the Jews above, they support central power because local authorities tend to display local prejudice (such as anti-Semitism). They also support leveling because the less the difference between one citizen and another, the less conspicuous is the reluctant Jew. Jews support civil rights (which can and do coexist with Communist and autocratic states). But some fear and abhor

political liberty because they do not trust power in the hands of the people or in the possession of local institutions of authority. They do all they can to transfer local power upward in order to concentrate power at the federal level. They intentionally blur the distinction between civil rights and political liberty so as to be perceived as champions of freedom when in fact they are among its greatest enemies. In chapter 24 we will explore the degree to which Jewish financiers played a role in supporting the governments of Prussia and Austria.

1 Charles Secondat, baron de Montesquieu, *The Spirit of the Laws*. trans. By Thomas Nugent (London, Hafner, 1949), 134.

2 Henry Kissinger, *A World Restored* (New York, Grossett and Dunlap, 1964), 131.

3 Walter Hubatch, *Frederick the Great of Prussia*. trans. by Patrick Doran (London: Thames and Hudson, 1975), 220.

4 *Ibid.*, 228.

5 *Ibid.*, 225.

6 *Ibid.*, 41.

7 *Ibid.*, 193.

8 *Ibid.*, 198.

9 *Ibid.*, 203.

10 *Ibid.*, 139.

11 *Ibid.*, 81.

12 *Ibid.*, 59.

13 *Ibid.*, 55.

14 *Ibid.*, 103.

15 *Ibid.*, 233.

16 *Ibid.*, 70.

17 Saul K. Padover, *The Revolutionary Emperor: Joseph II of Austria* (London, Eyre and Spottswoodie, 1967), 38.

18 *Ibid.*, 147.

19 *Ibid.*, 127.

20 *Ibid.*, 163, 150, 155, 163.

21 *Ibid.*, 179.

22 *Ibid.*, 161.

23 *Ibid.*, 155–6.

24 *Ibid.*, 139.

25 *Ibid.*, 131.

CHAPTER 23

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

France was an absolute monarchy until 1789. In that year a revolution, or more properly, a series of revolutions, ended what has been termed by historians the *ancien régime*. We need to look at the revolutionary period because it brought out all the isms that we have seen in the 19th, 20th, and that are still present in the 21st century. Democracy, capitalism, Communism, Socialism, Nazism, Fascism, and the “nanny state” are all prefigured in these pregnant years. So are state-sponsored terror and a variant of genocide in which a group of humans are liquidated not on the basis of race, but on the basis of social class. In order to have a blanket term for the aggregate of these revolutionary events, I will use the term Revolution (of 1789) with a capital R. I believe that 1789 is the most important date in modern history.

Prior to examining the Revolution in any detail, we need to look at the conditions that preceded it. France (in 1798), with a population of 25 million, was the largest state (outside of Russia) in Europe. It also had a standing army with state-of-the-art infantry, artillery, and cavalry. Thus continental Europe and Great Britain could not ignore what was happening in France. The state was an absolute monarchy which had achieved its greatest measure of centralized power during the reign of Louis XIV (reigned 1643–1715). He crushed any autonomy the nobility may have had. He was interested in his own aggrandizement; everything done in France was done for his glory. His statement “*l'état c'est moi*,” (I am the state) is absolutely appropriate. He was succeeded by his son Louis XV (reigned 1715–1774) who was no better. He was a hedonist, concerned only with living luxuriously and gratifying all his passions. Among his extravagances was the *parc aux cerfs*, an estate on which young girls were raised to meet his sexual pleasures. When he tired of one, he would marry her off to one of his courtiers and replace her with a younger model.¹ Although he did not say it, his motto could have been “*l'état c'est pour moi*” (The state exists for me). He was followed by Louis XVI, who was faced with political and financial crises that would have challenged the world's greatest statesmen. He was a dim bulb, to say the least, and lost any influence he might have had on the situation had he been a better man. He also lost his head. He said nothing. He had no motto. By the time of his reign, the machinery of state was on autopilot, run by an entrenched bureaucracy. He was too incompetent to be an effective autocrat, let alone a wise guide to a nation at the point of the most profound crisis in its national history.

Haunting the stage upon which the visible forces of politics and war played themselves out were the ideas of the *philosophes*. Little did anyone realize that these ideas were just about to materialize in a storm of fire and steel, clearing the old players off the stage. But back a step...who were the *philosophes*? They were a group of scientists, writers, musicians, and social theorists who spent their time discussing and popularizing new ideas. Many of these ideas were critical of established religion and questioned the inequities in the existing social order. They eventually combined much of their writing in an *encyclopédie*, which was to be a compendium of all human knowledge. Needless to say, it had to overcome numerous attempts at state and Church censorship.

The values the *philosophes* espoused were freedom of press and freedom of speech. Although the *philosophes* were largely Deists, thus not sympathetic to organized religion,

they supported freedom of worship. (Although Voltaire supported freedom of religion, he was hostile to Judaism, which he found regressive and particularly barbaric.) One of their chief beliefs was that of personal and social determinism. That is the belief that a given child is a blank slate, and he will become whatever his environment steers him to become. Also, citizens of a state will be molded according to the educational experiences they receive. Thus the nature of the citizenry is determinable by social planning. Historians sometimes seem surprised that the philosophes were honored guests in the courts of Joseph II (Austria) and Frederick the Great (Prussia) because the enlightenment belief in freedom of expression and opposition to organized religion would seem inimical to an autocratic state. But there were two reasons why the philosophes would be welcome: the first is that they were interesting men with interesting ideas. The other reason is their belief in the power of social conditioning to make perfect citizens and perfect citizens would lead to a perfect state. Thus the autocrat and the philosophe were not that far apart. But to be on the safe side, Frederick and Joseph prohibited the translation of the work of the philosophes into German.

We need to look at one of the philosophes in particular. Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778) addressed the education of the individual and the theory of government. I will focus on his theory of government. The reason that he is so important is that he was one of the very few writers who was able to capture and present to contemporaries and posterity alike a concise political statement powerful enough to have influenced human thought from his generation to ours. Upon his work is based the work of other writers. The foremost of these was Karl Marx, who played Jesus to Rousseau's John the Baptist. Ideas can float around in an inchoate form; then someone puts them in print in such a clear and compelling way that the ideas capture an age. So it was with both Rousseau and Marx. What Rousseau and Marx wrote in ink, their successors wrote in blood.

Rousseau wrote and published during the three decades that preceded the French Revolution. The ideas he presented served as the ideological basis of the Revolution. As we shall see, many of these ideas are compatible with Marxism, and are current today. Below are his major ideas, as expressed in his own words, followed by my glosses.

His initial premise is that current civilization is degeneration from an earlier human condition. The earlier human condition was in a state of nature and uncorrupted. The latter follows from the former. Our ancestor of this early period he refers to as the “noble savage.”

But savage man, living dispersed among other animals, and finding himself betimes in a situation to measure his strength with theirs, soon comes to compare himself with them; and perceives that he surpasses them more in adroitness than they surpass him in strength, learns to be no longer afraid of them.²

Being subject therefore to so few causes of sickness, man, in the state of nature, can have no need of remedies, and still less of physicians.³

I should be glad to have explained to me, what kind of misery a free being, whose heart is at ease and whose body is in health, can possibly suffer. I would like to know which is more likely to become insupportable to those who take part in it: the life of society or the life of nature. We hardly see anyone around us except people who are complaining of their existence.⁴

Many on the Left idealize the “noble savage” by assuming the American Indian had much better relationships with each other than are current in Western nations. Actual data show many wars among the Native Americans. Some were carried to the point of tribal extermination.⁵ Slavery was also an institution,⁶ as was torture of captives.⁷ Data from physical anthropology show evidence of serious disease, including widespread degenerative joint disease. Rousseau possessed more leisure time than hard anthropologic data.

There are also occasional instances of cannibalism.⁸ But Rousseau found this deficit an opportunity rather than a handicap. He set the pattern for the Left of drawing conclusions from inadequate (or no) documentation. In the event, the imaginary “noble savage” has proven to be useful as a weapon against Western culture.

The transition from the idyllic state of nature to civil society parallels, or is a secular retelling, of the expulsion from Eden. The sin is going from solitary living to group living. In going to group living, social structures are formed that are fatal to liberty: “Man is born free and everywhere he is in chains” (the most famous quote from *The Social Contract*). But since we have made this compromise, Rousseau offers to help us make the best of a bad situation. Any collection of people that identifies itself as a nation has to have rules to regulate how the members of the group relate to each other. Such is the origin of the legal code. Rousseau tells us that the laws made for this purpose must meet a certain criteria. In order to be legitimate, they must be an expression of the general will (*volonté générale*).

What is the general will? It is that which is best for society as a whole. It is the choice made by any and all individual citizens based on promoting the general good. It means the individual’s rejection of what might be to his particular benefit in favor of what is the best interest of the group. In addition, factions, or groups of people with similar interests, are obligated to renounce those factional interests if they do not tend to the best interest of the whole. “If you would have general will accomplished, bring all the particular wills into conformity with it; in other words, as virtue is nothing more than this conformity of the particular wills with the general will, establish the reign of virtue.”⁹ All statutory law, the letter of the law, is made to support the general will. Virtuous citizens really need minimal written law, because they know, by sentiment, what is right. “The greatest support of the public authorities lies in the hearts of the citizens, and...nothing can take the place of morality in the maintenance of government.”¹⁰ In fact, too much written law is dangerous: “For in this case the best laws become the most pernicious; and it would be a hundred times better that they should not exist. In such a situation, it is vain to add edicts and regulations to regulations. Everything serves only to introduce new abuses without correcting the old.”¹¹ The general will is the “most just” and “the voice of God.” It is infallible and indivisible.

The general will is not necessarily the voice of the people. “But how, I shall be asked, can the general will be known in cases in which it has not expressed itself? Must the whole nation be assembled together at every unforeseen event? Certainly not. It ought to be the less assembled, because it is by no means certain that its decision would be the expression of the general will.”¹² Happiness is achieved by conformity to the general will. However, Rousseau is aware that not everyone realizes wherein his happiness lies. Some people must “be forced to be free.”¹³

Such is the definition of the general will. I still don't know what it is; but whatever it is, it scares me.

What sort of economic philosophy can we expect from a society based on the general will? We can expect a "zero-sum economy": "Thus it is that we find our advantage in the misfortunes of our fellow-creatures, and that the loss of one man almost always constitutes the prosperity of another." This view is the pessimistic view of Socialists, Communists, and liberals. It pits the poor against the rich and is used to buy the votes of the have-nots. In reality, economic expansion leads to a win-win situation in which both parties engaged in a transaction come out ahead. Market allocation of goods and services leads to a greater aggregate sum of goods and services. Cuba and North Korea are mired in poverty because of their Marxist belief in zero-sum economics. For Rousseau to believe such nonsense in 1770 may be excusable; for liberal academics to believe it in the 21st century is an indication of ignorance or conscious deception. Another of Rousseau's policies is heavy taxation of "luxuries." This is also destructive to higher standards of living, as telephones and washing machines were once luxuries. In expanding economies, yesterday's luxury becomes today's necessity.

Rousseau's philosophy is based on the belief that man is primarily a product of his environment, a premise that is true to some extent. His corollary that we can control social machinery to ensure a certain behavioral output is not borne out by experience. What is certain is that such attempts have led to gnawing unhappiness at the best and gulags at the worst. Just in passing, it should be noted that Rousseau was certifiably insane.

When the Revolution began in France in 1789, the men who made it were weaned on Rousseau. The Revolution came about as the result of a financial crisis. The king was forced to convene the Estates Générale (a sort of national council) because the government had no money. It is interesting to note that the English Revolution of 1642 occurred in the same manner. The immediate cause of the American Revolution of 1776 was taxation.

Going back to France...the Estates Générale had not met for 200 years. The Estates Générale was composed of three classes, or "Estates." The First Estate was the clergy, and the Second was the nobility. Everyone else (about 98 percent of the nation) comprised the Third Estate. The Estates Générale represented all Frenchmen, but voted by Estate, each Estate having one vote. Since the clergy and nobility voted together, "commons" (the Third Estate) was always outvoted. The Estates Générale was convened on May 5, 1789. But by June 17, something happened that changed everything in France, forever. The First Estate termed itself the National Assembly and invited the other Estates to join it, on the basis of voting by delegate, not by Estate. (The Third Estate had the most delegates.) After some resistance, the other Estates joined. In effect, a Revolution had occurred, and France had become a constitutional monarchy.

One of the great what-ifs of history is what would have happened if the king had been a practical man, capable of accepting the inevitable change. In the event, he was not. As he proved unreliable and uncooperative, the power shifted entirely to the National Assembly, which subsequently termed itself the Constituent Assembly. The next stage in the ongoing Revolution was the sweeping away of the civil privileges of the nobility

(August 4, 1789), followed by the takeover of Church property on December 2, 1789. A very important event occurred on July 12, 1790, when the clergy were made state employees (Civil Constitution of the Clergy). The political temperature of France as a whole was lower outside of Paris. Paris was dominated by radicalized mobs, pandered to by journalists. The mobs and their more-educated leaders formed numerous extremist clubs, the most well-known of which was the Jacobins (ironically named for a Catholic ex-monastery where they met). Democracy had degenerated into ochlocracy (rule of the mob). The names of some of these orators and editors who played upon the mob are well known: Danton, Desmoulins, Marat, Robespierre. Soon there was civil war, followed by foreign wars as the monarchist neighbors of France feared the effect the ideas of democracy might have on their own populations. The combination of internal and external threats to the Revolution led to radicalization of the Assembly.

France was governed by Paris. Because the Assembly met in Paris, it was subject to mob pressure. At the least, disinterested debate could not take place in a meeting place with a dangerous mob milling around. If the Paris mob had been merely a potential threat before, it took actual control of the Assembly on August 10, 1792. From this point on, matters grew worse and worse, culminating in the Reign of Terror (1793–1794). This was also the time during which “political correctness” was first introduced as national policy. People were forbidden to use titles of rank and/or nobility. Use of “Monsieur” and “Madame” were forbidden. Everyone was to be addressed as “citizen.” In part of the program of dechristianization, the calendar was changed to start with Year One of the Revolution. (1789). The months were renamed. A description of the Terror (from Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th ed.) follows:

Couthon presented the crowning law of the Terror, known as the Law of 22 Prairial. As the Revolutionary Tribunal was said to be paralyzed by forms and delays, this law abolished the defense of prisoners by counsel and the examination by witnesses. Henceforward the impressions of judges and jurors were to decide the fate of the accused. For all offences the penalty was to be death. The leave of the Convention was no longer required for the arrest of a member. In spite of some murmurs even this law was adopted. Its effect was fearful. The Revolutionary Tribunal had hitherto pronounced 1200 death sentences. In the next six weeks it pronounced 1400. With Robespierre’s approval, St. Just sketched at this time the plan of an ideal society in which every man should have just enough land to maintain him; in which domestic life should be regulated by law and all children over seven years should be educated by the state. Pending this regeneration of society St. Just recommended the rule of a dictator.¹⁴

A point of significance, rarely raised, was the liquidation of a group of people based on social class; in this case the aristocracy. In the Communist revolutions of the future, liquidation by class will become common. It is important to note that the Jewish Left never lets us forget about the Holocaust based on race, but we never hear about holocausts based on class. Could one of the reasons be that they participated as Stalin’s butcheries during the Ukrainian holocaust of the 1930s? It is estimated that 5 million Ukrainians were starved to death. This issue will be examined at length in chapter 37.

The above quote from Britannica (1911) is very significant. It was written before the Communist Revolution of 1917 in Russia. Events in France foreshadowed the Russian Revolution by proposing a program of land redistribution, state control of children over

age seven, ruthless terror as a means of governance, law made at the pleasure of a small group of men, and imposition of dictatorial rule pending the development of the “new man.” It is uncanny how closely Lenin followed the playbook of Robespierre and St. Just. I will demonstrate how the Jewish Left in the U.S. seeks to take us down the same path.

At the point where too many people felt threatened by the Terror, it was stopped, and the terrorists were themselves guillotined. Confusion continued to grow, and anarchy threatened. The inevitable dictatorship occurred under the rule of Napoleon Bonaparte, commencing in 1799.

Napoleon’s Impact

France had gotten rid of all statutes mandating special rights for nobility during the first year of the Revolution. But there were still extant the many local city, town, and corporate laws and provisions made over the centuries. Napoleon abolished them and replaced them with a uniform code of law based on Roman law. The Code Napoleon took effect on March 31, 1804. Its strength was that it granted full civil rights to all citizens, thus giving Jews and Protestants rights equal to Catholics. This was far stronger than an edict of toleration or the provisional gift of an emperor. Equal rights before the law for all citizens was built in as a fundamental given of the new state. Even when the Napoleon’s Empire passed and the monarchy restored, the Code was retained. It was considered such an improvement over what preceded it, that it is still the basis of French law.

Balance of Power

In most respects, Napoleon was an enlightened despot. His weakness was his obsession to rule all of Europe and to try to do this by force. After Napoleon had passed the peak of his power, he no longer posed a threat the independent states of Europe. At this point it was unnecessary for the monarchs of Europe to fear him, because Napoleon shared their view of the role of central power. This was recognized by the most important man in Europe, Prince Clemens von Metternich, who was the Foreign Secretary of the Austrian Empire. Therefore Metternich tried to get Napoleon to compromise his ambition to be ruler of all of Europe and to settle for being Emperor of France. Since Napoleon’s military position was very weak, he should have accepted the offer.¹⁵ He did not. I think he was insecure because he did not come from a legitimate princely line, and thus for him as for Hitler, it was all or nothing.

After Napoleon’s fall, Metternich continued his efforts to find an autocrat to rule France and opposed efforts of the victorious European states to weaken the defeated French nation. Metternich knew that Austria would need a strong France to combat the growing power of Prussia. Thus begins the European balance of power that held until World War II.

1 Le siècle des saint-sevin dits l’abbé, <http://perso.orange.fr.saint-sevin/pg1lab.htm> (2007).

2 Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract and Discourses*, trans. by GDH Cole (London and Toronto: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1923), 54.

3 *Ibid.*, 57.

4 Ibid., 70.

5 George T. Hunt, *The Wars of the Iroquois* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1940), 6, 94, 100, 119.

6 Ibid., 94.

7 Ibid., 41, 73, 142.

8 Michael A. Hoffman, *Egypt Before the Pharaohs* (New York: Dorset Press, 1979), 97, 173.

9 Ibid., 140.

10 Ibid., 140.

11 Ibid., 140.

12 Ibid., 138.

13 Ibid., 195.

14 *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th ed., sv “French Revolution.”

15 Henry Kissinger, *A World Restored*. (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1964), 41.

CHAPTER 24

CENTRAL EUROPE: LANDS AND SPIRIT

As always, it is easier to understand history by looking at maps. In 1812, France, under Napoleon, was at the height of its power. Looking at a map of Europe at that time shows that French speakers were generally located west of the Rhine, and German speakers east of the Rhine (map V). The problem is generally, Who will rule the border lands? Those areas with mixed populations? Look at the map more closely and locate the Rhine River as it leaves the mountains of Switzerland. Just north of Switzerland, along the west bank of the Rhine, lie the two provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. Rulership of this territory was fought over between France and Germany. Follow the Rhine as it continues north, until it reaches the border of Holland. There is a long, narrow strip of land, along the western bank of the Rhine. The people in this area speak German. Immediately west of this north-south narrow band, the population speaks French, until we get to Belgium, when most of the people along the Belgian-German border speak Flemish, a dialect of Dutch. The soil of these areas along the northern Rhine absorbed the blood of millions of soldiers from 1870 to 1918.

Germany, at the beginning of the nineteenth century was not a single land. It was composed of about 300 independent political entities. Among these, there were a few large states, of which the most important was Prussia. Austria was a German-speaking state also, but it was a special case, as it was part of an empire ruled by the reigning head of a dynasty named the Hapsburgs. As such, it cannot be considered a part of Germany.

By 1812, the French, under Napoleon, controlled large amounts of German territory. The French directly controlled all the German-speaking land on the left (western) bank of the Rhine. Most of the German states east of the Rhine (except Prussia) were consolidated into one and termed “The Confederation of the Rhine.” The Confederation was controlled from Paris as a puppet state. In 1806, French troops defeated the Prussian army at Jena

(see map V) and proceeded from Jena to occupy Berlin. From Berlin they dictated peace terms to Prussia. As a result of the Napoleonic Wars, Prussia was humiliated by France. Two major things happened as a result of the French occupation of “Germany.” First, an unintended consequence was the reduction in the number of small German-speaking states, helping to speed the unification of Germany. Paradoxically, the French-engineered amalgamation of these small states was to have a devastating effect upon France. The second thing was the very powerful enmity toward France on the part of many Germans. There followed from this a very strong growth of German nationalism, which was to be of enormous consequence to the entire world.

German Nationalism

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the language of all the courts of Europe was French. It is the greatest irony that when German, Russian, and Austrian generals met to discuss strategy against the French, they spoke in French. Frederick the Great, the founder of the modern German state, spoke French better than German, and he handwrote his last will and testament in French. But the Germans were starting to break away from French cultural as well as military dominance. The great philosophers (Kant, Fichte, Hegel) wrote in German, and Goethe, that “one-man institution,” elevated the German language to new heights. The Grimm brothers collected German folk tales and were also philologists (students of the history and development of language) of German. There was renewed interest in German medieval history. The Prussian loss at Jena was tinged with irony; as the battle occurred there, the University of Jena was closed, and the students and professors had to flee. Hegel fled, just as he was completing *The Phenomenology of Spirit*. Fichte fled also. He was writing *Addresses to the German Nation*. What Prussian arms could not do on the battlefield was about to be accomplished by German letters. The manuscripts of Hegel and Fichte were worth more than all the French army corps at Jena!

Fichte’s *Addresses to the German Nation* (a total of fourteen speeches) succeeded in more than stirring up German resistance to French imperialism. They also served as a declaration of German cultural identity that has remained potent into the twentieth century. The purpose of the lectures was to define a German citizen. He began by rejecting class identity in favor of national identity.¹ Language was an essential bond between Germans. It gave them a common way of sharing experiences. Foreign languages, such as French, he termed “dead” and incapable of expressing pure German ideas. That is because as language evolves, it carries its historical baggage with it.²

German culture was to be kept pure and did not need to draw on other cultures (read French culture). Fichte taught that the French language was a derivative of Latin, hence a spiritually dead language.³ For Germans, the “golden age” of Greece is to be no model, because, like the Latin and Greek languages, it is derivative and cannot relate to the German experience. Traditional religion, he also considered dead and was to be replaced by morality.⁴ I must give Fichte credit for stating openly his plan for scotching religion in the state; the New England Protestant elite was soon to do the same, but was too cowardly to admit it. Thus where German Protestants had honesty, New England Protestants had hypocrisy. In any case, to both groups, God was dead.

The means for achieving the German state and culture was education. Education was to be universal and to stress the commonality of German identity rather than social class.

The purpose of education was to make the perfect man as a means of making the perfect state.⁵ Education was not meant to stimulate original thinking.⁶

In assessing the impact of the above on German national life, we need to remember that it was written to protest French influence in Germany. However, looking forward, we have to ask how a non-German people would fare in a nationalistic Germany. As we know today, not very well. Consider the Jews in Germany. Fichte himself did not say that one had to be racially German to be German. He stated:

Whoever believes in spirituality and in the freedom of this [German] spirituality, and who wills the eternal development of this spiritual freedom, wherever he may have been born and whatever language he speaks, is of our blood; he is one of us, and will come to our side. Whoever believes in stagnation, retrogression, and the round dance of which we spoke, or sets a dead nature at the helm of the world's government, wherever he may have been born and whatever language he speaks, is non-German and a stranger to us; and it is to be wished that he would separate himself from us completely, and the sooner the better.⁷

Fichte's openness in allowing "others" to become German would not be shared with many other nationalists of the future. The story of the attempts of Jews as individuals and as groups to become an accepted part of the German nation is a tragic story because so many were patriotic Germans and did everything possible to become German, only in the end to be rejected. It is particularly ironic in the face of the many current Muslim German citizens who are openly hostile to assimilation.

Prussia After Napoleon

After the final defeat of Napoleon in 1815, two major changes started to reshape Prussia: Industrialization and Expansion. Bit by bit, small German states began to be absorbed by Prussia. The idea gained currency that an eventual pan-German state was necessary and would eventually come into existence. The question was whether it would be unified under Austria as part of the large, multinational Hapsburg Empire or result from the eventual accretion of the small German states unto the body of the expanding Prussian state. The point at issue was whether the new Germany was to be a Grossdeutsch state that would include non-German peoples (under Austria) or a Kleindeutsch, purely German-speaking nation (under Prussia). Whatever the outcome, a rivalry between Prussia and Austria, as foreseen by Metternich, was now present and would be settled by war, to Prussia's benefit.

In an effort to increase trade and prosperity in northern Germany, Prussia and many of the smaller states around it formed a tariff-free free-trade zone called the Zollverein. It was an enormous boon to prosperity for all involved and also served to plant in people's minds not only the idea of a unified state, but of a unified state under Prussia. Austria was specifically excluded from this union. She had her own free-trade zone in the form of the multinational, multilingual Hapsburg Empire. The states of the Zollverein had coal and steel resources. Unlike Britain, they were not dependent on foreign trade. They had river transportation and dug canals. They had a labor pool of hardworking people, capable of becoming skilled at technical work. They were agriculturally self-sufficient. And they had the relative peace of post-Napoleonic Europe. By the middle of the nineteenth century, they challenged Britain in coal, steel, and railway production. In the first half of

the nineteenth century, investment capital was largely provided by government funds, and most projects involved government investment. But by the middle of the century, there was enough free-market capital available to create almost 300 joint stock companies.

The simultaneous occurrence of at least partial Jewish emancipation and the industrial revolution provided a fortuitous opportunity to Jews, and they were quick to use it. Jewish banking skills were valuable to the state, and Frederick the Great was quick to take advantage of them. During the Seven Years' War, he solicited and received Jewish financial expertise from two prominent Jewish bankers. "Frederick II gave [Daniel] Itzig and V. H. Ephraim contracts for financing the war through the issuance of successive series of debased coinage."⁸ Daniel Itzig was also personal financier to Frederick the Great's successor, Frederick William II. He was also appointed court banker and inspector of road construction. These Jews were of great importance in the early creation of a powerful Germany. Note the ever-recurrent "Joseph and Pharaoh" relationship. Note also the willingness of Jewish plutocrats to enable heads of state to violate justice. We will see this repeated time and again. We can carry it forward to the Clinton-Jew relationships of the present era. There are many instances, but the most egregious is the Sandy Berger episode (Sept. and Oct., 2003), in which Burger purloined government files for the (apparent) benefit of the Clinton administration. The biographical sketch of Itzig in *Encyclopedia Judaica* ends with the laconic note "Virtually none of Itzig's descendents remained Jews." It is likely that Jews are no more easily corrupted by power than any other race, but the opportunity for exposure to temptation is greater, as Jews seek relationships with the powerful with greater determination.

Benjamin Ephraim (1742–1811) was also helpful to the Prussian state. "In 1779 he took on in his factory unemployed Jewish girls and women from the recently annexed Polish territory. He successfully averted the expulsion orders of Frederick William II by stressing the usefulness of his 700 to 1,500 workers to the state. In Berlin, Benjamin maintained a leading salon, was the first Jew to own an art collection, and had access to ruling circles, having loaned the king large sums before his accession."⁹ Most of the Ephraim descendents also became apostates.

A sad case of another banker is that of Solomon Heine (1766–1844). He was a banker in Hamburg. Following a great fire in 1844, he sustained the credit of the city by his bank. He also gave heavily to community charities, but was still denied citizenship and admission to the Chamber of Commerce.¹⁰ It is heartbreaking how hard these men strove for acceptance, even to the point of conversion. Still, acceptance was grudging at best.

By the middle of the nineteenth century, the ruler of Prussia was Kaiser William I. His Chancellor was Otto von Bismarck, who was far more aggressive than the kaiser he served. Two questions of great geopolitical importance were on the table. First, which state, Prussia or Austria, would be the nucleus of a large German state and thus the principle power in central Europe? Bismarck resolved this question by provoking a war with Austria, which Prussia won. The next question, with Austria out of competition, was: What would be the new relationship between France and Prussia? The resolution of this question came as a result of the total defeat of the French in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–1871. In order to win these wars, Prussia needed access to international capital and good financial management domestically. This was provided by Gerson von

Bleichroder. He was the financial genius behind the Prussian war machine.¹¹ He was also the personal financial manager for Bismarck: “Pomeranian estate owners have always had their House Jew. I am a Pomeranian estate owner and have Bleichroder.”¹²

The consequences of this war were more than I can explore here, but two of the major consequences have to be mentioned. The most important one was the amalgamation of all non-Austrian German-speaking states in one German Reich (empire). Not all the German states entered this union entirely willingly, but under wartime conditions they had little choice. As a result, for the first time in modern history, Germany became a united and powerful modern state. Jewish bankers played a key role in this fateful happening.

The second consequence of the war was to set the stage for German autocracy. Bleichroder worked closely with Bismarck and the government “to lessen the influence of parliament on the resolution of economic questions.”¹³ He also helped to curb freedom of the press¹⁴ and “played a major role in the nationalization of Prussian railroads.”¹⁵

Following the war, Bismarck turned to the internal politics of the new German state. He consciously decided to develop a nanny state, not because he felt it was morally right, but because it would be a way of tying the people to the state. It was pure cynicism and calculated instrumentalism: “Bismarck had always been an interventionist and a paternalist; economic necessity, political calculation, and personal predilection combined to set his course in the late 1870’s and 1880’s. He set a new tone as well as policy: the new Reich should appear not only as tax collector, oppressor of Socialists, or rival old dynasties, but as a beneficent agent, as protector of the nation in the social realm—hence shield the workers from the ravages of occupational accidents, sickness, and old age. The state should offer succor—so the subjects might be grateful.”¹⁶ (My italics). It is important to note that under these circumstances, volunteerism and charity become politically incorrect because individual initiative weakens dependency on the state. With implications fateful for the future (Hitler), Bleichroder supported Bismarck in the parliamentary elections of 1878.

Bismarck’s electoral victory was great, as was the renewed defeat of German liberalism. It was a victory won by a campaign of ruthless vilification; the example set and the results achieved did great harm to the political future of Germany. The French chargé d’affaires in Berlin appreciated the importance of the moment:

A German Caesarism—the ideal of this great authoritarian and in his mind more and more connected with the end of Germanic unity—should [now] be close to realization. It is true that this order of things apparently can exist only with Prince Bismarck, that he is the only one capable of directing and dominating it; was this not proven in the political struggle that has just ended, where his personality united scattered and indecisive forces and was the principle element of his victory?¹⁷

Austria

We now leave Germany to go to Austria, the other German-speaking state in central Europe. To the south and east of Germany lay the lands of the Austrian Empire. Although large in extent of land and population figures, it suffered the weakness of being multinational and multilingual. It contained Germans, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Italians,

Hungarians, Romanians, and many other nationalities. This collection of peoples developed over centuries as subjects of the Hapsburg Emperors. These disparate lands were the personal possessions of the emperor. It was truly a medieval state in how it developed. It was not based on nationalism; in fact, nationalism was its greatest enemy. In addition to a common ruler, it had one other unifying force: the only common language was German. This does not mean that all the citizens of the empire spoke German. But as German was the language of government, anyone wanting to get ahead in government or business had to speak German. For the Jews, who lived scattered throughout this empire, this was a great advantage. Their mother tongue, Yiddish, was a dialect of German. Besides, learning German opened the way to entry into the civil service anywhere in the empire.

Austria, like Prussia, was modernizing with new roads, bridges, canals, and railroads. It needed capital. It also needed capital for war. Austria was fortunate to be the home of the Rothschild family. They were loyal to the state and were accepted by the emperors as friends and loyal subjects. Also the Rothschilds had an ally in Metternich, the most powerful man in the empire after the emperor himself. The major problem the Rothschilds had was the anti-Semitism of the nobility and the town councils.¹⁸ This was a problem throughout the empire. Jews could only count on the emperor. This reinforced Jewish support for the central government. The wars against Napoleon allowed the Rothschilds (1) to demonstrate loyalty to Austria by arranging war funding, (2) to grow their fortune as a result of such funding, and (3) to win the confidence of the emperor and Metternich.¹⁹ The vast majority of Rothschild business was with government loans, both within the empire and to nations allied with the empire.²⁰ Private sector investment did not play a significant role in their rise to riches. This supplied one more reason for their statist predilection. We must note here the enormous potential for resentment that developed among the nobility and local government toward Jews.

In this history of central Europe, we have seen Austria lose out to Prussia as the German fatherland. We have also seen that Austria comprises a multinational, multilingual state in which the emperor is friendly to Jews and in which Jews are handmaidens to the emperor. There was an uneasy peace in the empire, as nationalist sentiments struggled against the centralizing tendency in Vienna, capital of the empire. Maintaining a centralized state was to the benefit of most Jews because national identity as “subjects of the Emperor” was inclusive, whereas identity as a Czech, Pole, or Hungarian was too exclusive to admit Jews. In non-German parts of the empire, Jews were disliked because they were Jews and were German-speaking. In German-speaking lands they were reviled as being Jews. The best hope for Jewish safety seemed to be a strong, benevolent, central power.

As it turned out, two of these three requirements were to be met.

1 J. G. Fichte, *Addresses to the German Nation*, trans. by RF Jones and GH Turnbull (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1968), 13.

2 *Ibid.*, 59.

3 *Ibid.*, 75.

4 *Ibid.*, 33.

5 *Ibid.*, 87.

- 6 Ibid., 17.
- 7 Ibid., 107–108.
- 8 Encyclopedia Judaica 1st ed.. sv “Itzig.”
- 9 Encyclopedia Judaica. sv “Ephraim.”
- 10 Encyclopedia Judaica. sv “Heine.”
- 11 Fritz Stern, *Gold and Iron: Bismarck and Bleichroder* (New York: Vintage Books, 1977), chapters 4, 5, and 6.
- 12 Ibid., 96.
- 13 Ibid., 196.
- 14 Ibid., 273.
- 15 Ibid., 216.
- 16 Ibid., 208.
- 17 Ibid., 200–201.
- 18 Egon Conti, *The Rise of the House of Rothschild* (Boston: Western Islands Press, 1972), 162.
- 19 Ibid., Chapter III, *The Great Napoleonic Crisis and Its Exploitation by the House of Rothschild*.
- 20 Ibid., Chapter IV, *The Brothers Rothschild During the Period of Congresses, 1818–1822*.

RESPONSES TO EMANCIPATION I: ASSIMILATION

CHAPTER 25

Assimilation

During the centuries of exile, Jews have lived separately from Gentiles. It would appear they have resisted assimilation over the ages. Or have they? It is much more likely that most Jews took the course of least resistance over the centuries and did assimilate. If this is true, it is only the small non-assimilating residue that makes up today’s recognized Jews. Judaism is (or was) more than a religion and culture. It was a group of people who traced their descent from Abraham. They were proud of this direct descent. Within the children of Abraham, some were further set off. The descendents of Aaron formed the priestly class, and still today, those who mark their descent from Aaron are first called to Torah reading during orthodox services. The descendents of David are also set aside. This recognition of different hereditary classes is explained in the orthodox prayer book as follows:

“Blessed art Thou...For not having made me a gentile...a slave...a woman. The Torah assigns missions to respective groups of people. Within Israel, for example, the Davidic family Kohanim and Levites are set apart by virtue of their particular callings, in addition to their shared mission as Jews. All such missions carry extra responsibilities and call for the performance of the mitzvos associated with them. We thank God, therefore, for the

challenge of improving His universe in accordance with His will. Male, free Jews have responsibilities and duties not shared by others. For this, they express gratitude that, unlike women, they were not freed from the obligation to perform the time-related commandments.”¹

Jewish rituals involve numerous religious holidays not compatible with the Christian workweek. Dietary rules preclude Jews from dining with Gentile neighbors or being house guests of same. Since the effect of following the rules of the code of Jewish law effectively isolates Jews from non-Jews, it is a fair question to ask whether that is the purpose of the code. I cannot answer whether effect and purpose coincide. As long as Jews lived in ghettos and their own villages (shtetls) there was no strong force to weaken traditional lifestyles. Everything changed with emancipation. University life was now an option. Government offices were now an option. In these circumstances, at that time, keeping the Law was very difficult, if not impossible. One of the first things Jews in German-speaking lands did was to convert to Lutheranism or Catholicism. This was a sham, as the conversions were usually not motivated from the heart, and everyone knew it. In addition, the mainline Protestant religions in Germany had become subservient to the state and had lost much of their spiritual force. They were well on their way into the black hole of irrelevancy in which they now find themselves. True, there were Protestant religions, strong in faith, but they were out of the mainstream and not popular with the government. Jewish converts, motivated solely for social acceptance, naturally ignored these religions.

Still, in the early part of the nineteenth century, acceptance was still open (in theory) to Jews who would become “true Germans.” Fichte’s opinion is notable:

Fichte was against the awarding of the rights of citizenship to Jews as long as the Jews manifested a strong resistance to the general love of mankind, and as long as they (so he held) believed in two sets of moral laws, one for Jews and another for non-Jews. Distinguishing between human rights and rights of citizenship, he held that “human rights must be granted to them even though they do not grant them to us, for they are human beings and their injustice does not give us the right to be like them; but they must be denied the rights of citizens as long as even one Jewish idea remains with them.”²

As we have seen, the contest between Prussian hegemony (Kleindeutsch) and Austrian hegemony (Grossdeutsch) in the German-speaking lands was settled in favor of Prussia. Thus the German Empire, unlike the Austrian Empire, was purely German. Unlike the multinational, multilingual Austrian Empire, Germany was fulfilling the hopes of the German nationalist historian Heinrich von Treitschke “to dissolve the fairy-tale world of particularism and provide the basis for a free and powerful Germany.”³ Although Treitschke was referring to the small German states when he speaks of particularism, he later on singled out Jews. In his famous (or infamous) quote in 1879, he stated: “The Jews are our misfortune.” However, “Treitschke was not a racist in the Hitlerian sense of the word. He limited himself to demanding the rapid and complete assimilation of the Jews in the Germanic culture ‘without prejudice to their faith and their ancient sacred memories, which we all respect.’ ”⁴

By the latter half of the century, the benefits of conversion, already weak due to their widely recognized pro forma nature, were delivered their deathblow by the theories of

racial supremacy advanced by people such as Arthur Gobineau and H. S. Chamberlain. From this point forward, the expedient of conversion would not work. While one may choose a religion and change it at will, not so race.

Reform Judaism

For the German Jews of the mid-nineteenth century, it was not clear whether by “assimilation” one had to give up Judaism or not. As noted above, Orthodox Judaism was not compatible with traditional German life. Therefore, a third expedient was tried: a modification of Judaism. Up to this time, there was only one form of Judaism. One was a Jew, or not a Jew. For the first time in the history of Judaism, a non-Orthodox creed developed, and demanded to be acknowledged as a variant of Judaism, and not a new religion, as had been the case with Protestantism after the Reformation.

One of the principle leaders of the German Reform movement was Samuel Holdheim (1806–1860). He was one of the new type of rabbis who held degrees from German universities. It would be very unlikely that he would be any less hostile to conventional religious beliefs than any of the irreligious German philosophers such as Fichte or Hegel. He was appointed rabbi of the Berlin Reform congregation in 1847. From this position, he changed the Sabbath to Sunday. His attitude was that Judaism should conform itself to the particular national demands of the nation in which a Jew found himself: “In any case he was ready to compromise in the religious sphere if the need arose in the country in which the Jews were to be integrated.” He also felt that religious questions should be resolved on the basis of the written Torah, rather than Talmud.⁵ One of the serious problems of having Judaism conform to national custom would be a loss of its universality. Abraham Geiger (1810–1874) was a contemporary of Holdheim and, like Holdheim, was also a product of the German university system, that indifferent factory of good and evil. “In his desire to see Judaism solely as a religious community, Geiger set out to eliminate from Judaism every mark of national uniqueness and of dissociation from the gentile nations.”⁶

The attitudes of the men above show the dilemma of German Jews: how to be German and Jewish. There was never to be a satisfactory answer to this question. I believe that the attempts to remove from Judaism its “particularism” served to aid in its destruction as a living spiritual force in Germany (and subsequently in the U.S.). Incidentally, German Christianity had suffered the same fate, but for different reasons. In any case, regarding Judaism, there was a great irony here. Just at the time that Judaism was, chameleonlike, reforming itself so that Jews “could be like the other nations,” religious identity in Germany ceased to have the meaning it had when it was a choice from the heart, as opposed to membership in a state-controlled church. So religious identity paled, and racial identity took its place. For the Jews—all those efforts—a day late and a dollar short.

Marxism: If the Shoe Doesn't Fit,

Alter the Foot.

The third response, Marxism, was earth-shattering. Sometimes statements like “earth-shattering” are hyperbole, but not in this instance. Probably we would have to go back to

the Mongol invasions to find anything as catastrophic in the last thousand years. Its victims since 1917 number in the tens of millions.

Marxism is nothing more nor less than a Jewish response to the Jewish Question. This response to the Jewish Question was different from anything proposed then or since. Marx turned the Question on its head. Instead of saying what changes can Jews make to be accepted, it asked what needed to be done to the world, in order for it to be a safe place for Jews. The arrogance of the approach is only exceeded by the originality and scope of the answer. Karl Marx invented a new religion. Its god was the State. This new religion had its Prophet: fittingly it was Marx himself. It also had its “companion of the Prophet” in the person of Frederick Engels. It had its Holy Writ in *Das Kapital* and *The Communist Manifesto*. It developed its academic scholars, analogous to Talmudists, and some actually were ex-Talmudic scholars. However, I do not wish to deprive Gentile Marxists of due credit. Certainly the written works of Lenin and Mao are known to the entire world. It had its lines of succession (like the Caliphate) in which the power of state and church were united in the hands of a single autocrat (Stalin, Mao, Pol Pot, Castro, Kim Sung Il, etc.).

Why was there this drastic response? What could explain it, if not justify it? I will try to explain its motive force. Any examination of the history of the Jewish people in Europe and the Muslim world demonstrates an almost uniform experience of misery imposed by majority populations. The day-to-day existence of most Jews in most places for the last two thousand years has been that of degradation at a group and personal level. Few Jews outside of the United States and Israel have an unchallenged sense of being “OK” or at least the same as everyone else. Almost all of the period of exile has been one of assault on personal self-worth, and most of the period has carried with it the risk of sudden death at the hands of a mob. Sometimes the mob was sponsored by the state. It is not possible to suffer this abuse without a warpage of the soul. Many of its victims engage in self-hate and become threats to themselves. Reason suffers by distortion. Values applied to decision-making are based on skewed experience and frequently satisfy limited goals at the expense of long-range solutions. There is very little as damaging to a group of people as an accepted sense that it belongs to a subclass of human beings. These people become not only destructive to themselves, but can become destructive to the rest of the world. This is particularly true when the people is, in fact, talented.

I hope that I have given some measure of understanding as to the force motivating Marx.

Before presenting an overview of Marx’ principles, I would like to speculate on their origin. They are really not so startlingly original. As noted above, the Jewish race has experienced persecution for centuries: Which experiences brought relief? These experiences needed to be analyzed, the germ of these experiences, understood and culled out. After generalized premises are distilled from these experiences, they are to be codified and made into positive law in the form of “Thou shalt” in the Marxist legal code. Which experiences made life worse for Jews? They will be similarly understood, and a list of “Thou shalt not” will be similarly entered in the form of negative law.

These positive and negative precepts will have to be obeyed in order for the new social order to work. In both cases, the reasons for requiring certain social behaviors and forbidding others will have to be explained on the basis of a theory that is far more

intellectually respectable than the real reason for the rules. Making life safe for Jews is too parochial a rationale: making life safe for the working class and downtrodden has far more universal validity and will appeal to the easily manipulated masses. The theory will have to appear elegant, parsimonious, and be easily grasped. It will have to appeal to laborers and intellectuals alike. It will have to be so inspiring that people would dedicate their lives to studying it and promoting it. It must be noble enough that people could say, "I am a Communist," with as much pride as someone else might say, "I am a Christian." Last but not least, its believers must be willing to die (and kill!) for it. It must be, in other words, a religion.

1 The Complete ArtScroll Siddur, trans. by Nossan Scherman (New York: Mesorah Publications, Ltd, 1995), 19.

2 Encyclopedia Judaica. sv "Fichte."

3 James J. Sheehan, German History: 1770–1866 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 846.

4 Encyclopedia Judaica. 1st ed. sv "Treischke."

5 Ibid., sv "Holdheim."

6 Ibid., sv "Geiger."

CHAPTER 26

MARXISM

As a German and a Jew, he [Marx] is authoritarian from head to toe.

-Bakunin

We have addressed in the previous chapter the why of Marxism. Now we must define what it is. Marxism is the abandonment of the attempt on the part of the Jewish Left to assimilate into existing society. Instead it attempts to remake society into its image of what it considers the final state of human perfection. It could be considered the Revenge of the Jews. Now for the details...

I will discuss Marxism as it relates to (1) family structure, (2) economic activity, and (3) the political structure. In discussing Marxism, I make reference to the works of Marx and Frederick Engels without distinction. Engels was Marx' amanuensis, and historically their writings are viewed as a unit. I will follow that practice.

The World According To Marx

The driving force of civilization is conflict.¹ Going to the very root of civilization, the initial conflict is between man and woman: "The first class antagonism which appears in history coincides with the development of the antagonism between man and woman in monogamian marriage, the first class oppression of the female sex by the male."² After reading this quote, no one should be surprised at feminist rants against men, marriage, and current culture. However, the feminists certainly lack originality, having to go back over a century to Marx for their dogma. Marriage and sexual monogamy are out, since they are the result of class oppression. All children are to be raised in common, in State nurseries. (Remember "It takes a village"? This is where Hillary Clinton cribbed the idea.

Pure Marx.) Bill Clinton is a good Marxist role model for monogamy. Also, home schooling, or parent control over education, is a bourgeois concept, and besides, most parents are too stupid to raise their own children without the help of “experts.” Another blow against the family is the abolition of inheritance.

Dismantling the family was a start. Now we dissolve all classes.³ There are to be no owners; everyone is a worker. One for all, all for one. One big happy fam—sorry, we can’t say family. One big happy proletarian commune! There, that’s politically correct. Since “the idiocy of rural life” retards the development of our secular utopia, the difference between rural and city will be abolished by distributing people more uniformly.⁴ To the Jewish Left, people can be sown like seed corn. In the former “peoples’ republics” of the USSR and puppet states, this was done on a wide scale. Those elements who resisted were liquidated. (Remember the 5 million Ukrainian peasants? Of course, you don’t. The New York Times, owned and operated by the Jewish Left, then printed Stalin’s lies as they now print those of his successors. Read the history of Pulitzer Prize-winning NYT writer Walter Duranty, chapter 37.) Following the abolition of class is the abolition of the State. However, before the State can be abolished, a period of dictatorship of the proletariat is essential to liquidate remaining bourgeois elements. After that, the State (that is the dictatorship) will wither away. ⁵ And we will all live happily ever after! Not quite yet. You can’t safely turn one state into paradise in a predatory world. It follows that the advantages of Communism must be shared with all peoples. Toward this end, we must do away with nation-states, national borders, and national identification.⁶ Then won’t we all be members of one universal happy family! Unfortunately there are always a few misguided or deluded individuals who cannot see what is best for them. As Rousseau said, we will “force them to be free.”⁷ Maybe a handful (100 million?) will have to be “removed,” but you can’t make an omelet without breaking some eggs.

After seeing how Communists, where given the opportunity, have succeeded in making a hash out of family and state, let us examine how these saintly altruists propose to run an economy. No real surprises here. Since leveling is the guiding principle, money will be abolished.⁸ Also to be abolished is the use of precious metals, or anything that can serve as a store of value.⁹ The power to accumulate opens the way for some people to have more than others. Therefore retention of private property is illegal. Trade allows some to get more than others, so it too must go. Exchange is the road to hell.¹⁰ Clearly the middlemen (traders) produce nothing. They just accumulate the wealth produced by others.

A concise outline of the cultural anthropology upon which much of the above is based can be read in Engel’s *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. This book is clearly written and relatively short. One benefit of reading it is that you will have the entire playbook of the Left. This includes feminists, Socialists, Communists, liberals, Hollywood pop tarts, red diaper babies, hack columnists such as Maureen Dowd, and much of the professoriate of the American university system. The entire Pink Orchestra was weaned on this material.

We need to spend a little time discussing economic theory. Marx used classical economic theory, such as was presented by David Ricardo (1772–1823). I will give only a very general description of this theory. His theory, prevalent in the nineteenth century, stated

that the price or “value” of an item has two components. First, there is the cost of the material of which it is composed. The second factor is the value added to the raw material by labor. (A more complete explanation would include other factors, such as costs of machinery, etc.) The final value of the finished product, then, is the sum of the raw material plus the value added by the labor. The most common alternative theory (generally accepted today) was proposed in the early twentieth century. This theory states that the price or “value” of something is only what someone would be willing to pay for an item on the market at a specific time and under specific conditions. The term “hammer price,” which approximates these conditions, will have meaning to anyone who goes to auctions. It is also defined as what someone will pay for the most recent item produced (marginal price). It may well be that in many instances the value of an item would be the same (or nearly the same) under either the surplus value theory or the marginal value theory. But at the extremes of market conditions, (great surplus or great scarcity, great demand or little demand) the value predicted by each theory will greatly diverge. I will give two examples at the extreme. Let us say that you have a piece of wood. You decide to add value to the wood by carving it. The finished product is the sum of the value of the raw wood, plus the labor you put into it. But it may well be that you have put in hours of labor to produce something that people consider ugly. You cannot sell it now for more than the price of the raw wood. Another example would be a man who sells bottled water. The price he would get for a bottle of water from a customer who could go to another grocery store would be less than the price to a customer in Death Valley in August for the same bottle of water.

The next principle to understand is the function of price as an economic signal. Let’s consider the case of shoes. Consider that shoes are in short supply in Boston. This will result in the price of shoes going up in Boston. On the other hand, let us assume that the New Haven market has too many shoes. The price of shoes in New Haven will go down. These price fluctuations serve to signal suppliers what to ship to which city. They also serve to tell manufacturers what sort of goods are in demand and how much of a given good should be manufactured. The system is self-correcting and works with minimal waste.

We have stated that the distributor reads the price signals. Who is the distributor? He is the middleman. He makes a profit while producing nothing. But is he really producing nothing? Back to shoes. You have a foot of fixed length and width. You would like the shoe to fit. (The bourgeoisie are so spoiled.) You might even prefer a particular style and color (bourgeois tastes are so fickle!). Someone has to get the appropriate shoes to the appropriate end user. Under the Communist system, the worker in the shoe factory has no incentive to see that the product goes where it is needed. The factory manager has no incentive to distribute the shoes appropriately. No one has the incentive to make distribution work. What good does it do the end users to have shoes in a warehouse or randomly distributed throughout the country? Since employees of the state (that means everyone under Communism) are paid by the state, there is no incentive to “get it right.” In the west the “customer is king;” under Communism or Socialism, the customer is an annoyance.

We have two additional topics to consider, that of innovation, and that of corruption. First, innovation...Communism and Socialism are inherently conservative. Bureaucrats

do not like change, because responding to changing conditions is inimical to planned society. It is the elitist view that the important factors in production of goods and services can be identified and properly controlled by bureaucrats. This view is not borne out by experience. The proof of Communism's failing in the real world has been the need for industrial espionage. Industrial espionage is the only way Communist societies can keep up with technological advances, since innovation does not happen under bureaucratic rule.

Next, corruption. As I pointed out in chapter 21, corruption is an inevitable part of secular Socialist or Communist states.

To summarize, Marx has provided us with a worldview supported by discredited anthropology and discredited economic theory. It is most likely that he developed his conclusions first, and then cast about for the data to support them. The fact that neo-Marxists have built and are building on his work indicates that support for Communism is based on faith rather than science. The charge that Communists make against religion can be turned against them on substantive grounds, because believers in God accept revelation, but Communists claim not to. Yet they continue to believe in what cannot be proven. Is this not faith? I would call Communism an antireligion. That is not the same as anti religion. Anti religion defines someone who is opposed to religion. Antireligion means someone who has a religion, which may be defined as the antinomy of religion. As the antinomy of religion, it too holds meaning; it is not nothing. It is analogous to comparing the negative and positive poles of a magnet: equal but opposite.

Going back to consider the society Marx offers us by fixing everything from the nuclear family to the family of nations, we find ourselves in possession of a roadmap to utopia. But is it really such a map? What is it really? It is a protected environment in which a Jew may finally feel no threat. Under the conditions Marx prescribes, there is no way to consider the Jew as separate or different. Marx has given us a roadmap for the benefit of a few, under the clever guise of salvation for all. It has been very easy for other aggrieved social groups to be intoxicated by the cyanide of Marxism. It has simplicity and claims universality. It is understandable to the masses. It is the most parsimonious explanation of culture ever devised, and usually the most parsimonious explanation is the one likely to describe reality best. But not always. It also has an allure for intellectuals, because it is clearly elitist. It makes

absolutely clear that the proletariat needs to be led by elite cognoscenti, because the workers' ability to determine what is in their best long-term interests is subject to bourgeois meddling. The people, Marxists claim, are susceptible to intoxicants such as religion, "the opiate of the masses." Marxism is tempting to the academics, intellectuals, and society's overeducated misfits because it gives a leadership role to them. It also gives them a secular religion, which is easier to live with than nihilism or existentialism. As a religion, it supplies the third of Kant's "regulative principles" discussed earlier. Raymond Aron once commented, "Marxism is the opiate of the intellectuals." Very true. I do not think that Marx consciously developed his philosophy to make the world "safe for Jews." In fact, he despised Jews. No Nazi anti-Semitic tract could take a backseat to Marx' two essays on "The Jewish Question." But he grew up in a milieu in which the dilemma of assimilation was real for him, and his response was based on the general question of the place for the "other."

The most dangerous aspect of Communists (and the Left in general) is arrogance. This arrogance blinds them to contradiction. How could they not be arrogant? They alone possess the knowledge of the dialectic of historical materialism underlying human civilization. Armed with this knowledge, they have a moral right, rather responsibility, to take power. Given the certitude of their understanding of the fundamental, unalterable course of history, they, and they alone, are privileged to operate under the presumption that the ends justify the means. Only such moral certainty could lead them to plan the slaughter of 100 million human beings and to participate in the actual killing. It also takes arrogance to turn a blind eye to a seventy-year, continuing holocaust. Karl Marx was the first in a line of a new type of Jew. Arrogant, certain, true believers, proselytizing, and dedicated as much as humanly possible to their ideology. There is a word for such a person: Judeofascist. These Judeofascists have Gentile counterparts such as the Kennedys and the Clintons. I call these folks “White Jews.”

1 Robert C. Tucker, *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 2nd ed. (New York: WW Norton and Co., 1987), 473.

2 *Ibid.*, 739.

3 *Ibid.*, 487.

4 *Ibid.*, 477.

5 *Ibid.*, 220.

6 *Ibid.*, 487.

7 Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Du Contrat social* (Paris: GarnierFlammarion, 1966), 149.

8 Frederick Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, trans. by Alec West (New York: International Publishers, 1973), 138.

9 *Ibid.*, 225.

10 *Ibid.*, 175.

CHAPTER 27

BEYOND MARX: THEORY AND PRACTICE

Karl Marx was not the only pioneer on the Jewish Left. His contemporary, Ferdinand Lassalle, was more practical in his approach to Socialism. Lassalle was born Ferdinand Lassalle to a middle-class Jewish family in Breslau in 1825. From the point of view of our history, the most important thing he did was to found the first German Workers' Party (*Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverein*) in 1863. Lassalle was a popular figure among actual workers.¹ Marx was a cold theoretician and did not relate well to real workers. Actually, he didn't relate well to most human beings. Marx preferred workers who had the decency to remain abstract. Thus it is not surprising that Lassalle's influence at the time was far greater than that of Marx, although Marx' eventual impact on the world was to be infinitely greater and infinitely more malevolent. The thrust of Lassalle's work was to put the representatives of workers into the political structure, thus to become eventual participants in government. Marxists opposed collaboration with the existing system;

Marxian Communists considered working through the established structures to be a betrayal of the eventual proletarian revolution.

The Socialists (including the followers of Lassalle) who worked through the parliamentary structure eventually formed the Social Democratic Party (SPD) of Germany. By 1914, the SPD was the largest single party in the Reichstag (Parliament). The SPD was the political organ of the German Workers' Party.

At the time of the founding of the German Workers' Party, the German emperor (Kaiser) was Wilhelm I. But more importantly, the chancellor was Otto von Bismarck. Bismarck was the real power. "In May 1863, Prussia has two despots, Bismarck and Lassalle. The former wields the power of which the latter dreams."² What the author means is that Lassalle as leader of the Socialist movement has more power than Bismarck as chancellor of the empire. What to do? Bismarck invites Lassalle for a series of chats! Taking into account the rigid social structure of Prussia, it is hard to imagine a Prussian Junker (nobleman) inviting a Jew for a series of chats, but it happened. They found they had something in common. The power of the state:

During the first half hour, the two agree that they have a "common metaphysical ground". The Junker wields the power of the State. The Hegelian [Lassalle] is the advocate of the power of the State...for both of them the State signifies the restriction on individual liberty. For both of them the idea of the State has a dictatorial character.

Bismarck, being the arch enemy of the bourgeoisie, needs the sympathy of the proletariat...Lassalle...urges the inauguration of State enterprises...[This] notion appeals strongly to Bismarck. The State as entrepreneur—this would mean a huge increase in the economic powers of the State. The king, who is already chief judge, chief priest, and chief soldier, would become chief factory owner! It implies the extension of State supremacy into the domain of industry. The State will undertake social reform.

The program which brings Bismarck and Lassalle together is one which aims at increasing State authority and at the weakening of liberalism.³

I am afraid that for those of us who cherish liberty, there is little to choose from among Marx, Lassalle and Bismarck. These chats foreshadowed the social reforms instituted by Bismarck to preserve the status quo and the eventual realization of the corporate welfare state which obtains in the German Federal Republic today.

The German Jewish Socialists and Communists are but the age-old continuation of the Jewish sickness of supporting centralist tendencies in government. In the case of Germany, the Frankenstein effect will be horrific under the Third Reich. But as always, few Jews will learn the obvious lesson despite the terrible cost.

The Great War (World War I) was the most destabilizing and damaging event in the history of the modern world. It led to the simultaneous collapse of the Russian, Austro-Hungarian, German, and Ottoman empires (1917–1919). The stability of the old world, for all of its flaws, was lost at one stroke. With this loss, the chance of controlled evolution toward a better world was lost for at least a century. While the Ottoman and Russian empires might have been hopeless, at least the German and Austro-Hungarian empires contained elements that could have produced positive change. Instead we have reaped Blood and Terror until the collapse of the Soviet Empire. While historians and

philosophers will debate forever the causes of the Great War, my take is almost simplistic. The unlucky coincidence of Power and Chance in the hands of a deeply flawed personality allowed one man to give the order to open the Gates of Hell. Although Kaiser Wilhelm II did not create the demons of Hell, he unleashed them.

But we must narrow our scope and return to Central Europe. Following any political change, even so much as a routine national election when the endpoints of change are reasonably predictable, there are still unexpected consequences. How much the more so when an entire government collapses overnight with no mechanism of succession in place. So it was in Germany in November, 1918. The Kaiser's government evaporated overnight. In the face of the power vacuum, one of the first events was a naval mutiny by 40,000 radicalized sailors from the naval base at Kiel. The sailors fanned out through Germany, agitating for a Socialist revolution.⁴ In the meantime, a provisional government was set up by the SPD, the largest party in the Reichstag. Needless to say, this was a time of unprecedented chaos and confusion in Germany, the details of which are beyond the scope of this book. We will, however look at a few characters and events in this tragedy.

During and before the Great War, two German Jews assumed leadership positions within the left-wing political camp of the German Empire. Karl Liebknecht was one. He was one of the leaders of the German Socialist Party (SPD). But he felt that the SPD was not radical enough, and he became one of the founders of the Spartacist League (Spartakusbund) in 1916. In this endeavor he was joined by Rosa Luxemburg, a Marxist revolutionary born in Poland, but active in Germany. Building on the sailors' revolt, the Spartacists attempted a takeover of the state in Berlin and other cities. These events happened in the first weeks of 1919. By this time, the Spartacus League had become the Communist party of Germany (KPD). The revolt was quickly and bloodily suppressed by a mixture of government troops and right-wing volunteers called Freikorps (Free Corps). The Free Corps were unemployed demobilized soldiers unhappy with German defeat. They were easily induced to form reactionary forces willing to do the bidding of the extreme Right. They were to form the embryo of Hitler's SA. The shaky government of postwar Germany felt obliged to make use of these troops, despite the risk of making deals with the devil. In the process of suppressing the Communist revolt in Berlin, the Freikorps murdered Liebknecht and Luxemburg.⁵

It is hard to unconditionally condemn Liebknecht and Luxemburg within the context of the political and social situation in Germany at that time. Jews were certainly threatened by forces of the Right, while tyrannies of the Left were as yet unknown. What is unforgivable is the activity of the Jewish Left in the modern United States because they know where Communism leads. Despite this knowledge, they continue the same attack on pillars of liberty in the land that has given them haven. Savage Ingratitude!

Bavaria

In addition to the events in Berlin, we will look at the Communist takeovers of Bavaria and Hungary. Bavaria only became part of the German Empire in 1871 under pressure from Bismarck. It had been an independent kingdom for centuries and never quite felt easy about Prussian supremacy. Another source of friction between Prussia and Bavaria was that Bavaria is overwhelmingly Catholic, whereas Prussia is largely Protestant.

Therefore it is not surprising that Bavaria should have had separatist tendencies apart from the issue of Socialism. In early November of 1918, a local general was discussing mounting a last-ditch effort against the allies. This was too much for the cold and hungry population. During the course of a large peace rally in Munich, the leader of the Bavarian Socialist Party (SPD), Kurt Eisner, was addressing the crowd. A disabled veteran cried out, "All soldiers gather round Kurt Eisner."⁶ Later that day, the royal family, ending a reign of 738 years, fled from Bavaria. Under Eisner's "religion of Socialism" a new government was instituted.⁷ However, Bavaria had a religion, and the religion of the people was not Socialism. After a few months, when the armistice signaled the end of the war, the force of necessity and chance that put Eisner and the Socialists in charge lost its momentum. Eisner was an honest man and, unlike Lenin, was not willing to be a tyrant. He permitted free elections to a new Parliament (Diet). The results went against him and his party. Eisner accepted the results of the election, and on the morning of Feb. 21, 1919, he proceeded to walk to the Diet building in order to turn in his resignation. Just then "a trench-coated figure stepped out of a doorway behind [him]. It was Arco Valley. He fired two shots at Eisner's head from behind. Eisner swayed for a second, made as if to say something, and then collapsed on the pavement where a pool of blood began at once to form." Thus ended the first attempt at a Socialist government in Bavaria.

Efforts to establish a stable and legitimate government after the assassination failed. It was followed in early April, 1919 by a takeover by "a strange band of tribunes... the anarchist philosopher Gustav Landauer, the young dramatist Ernst Toller, the poet of Bohemian life, Erich Muhsam, whose chief political act was the writing of some verses called 'Der Lampenputzer' which slanged the Majority Socialists, and a demented academic named Dr. Franz Lipp, who assumed the post of Foreign Minister and immediately dispatched a telegram to 'Comrade Pope, Peter's Cathedral, Rome' in which he accused [the former Prime Minister] of having absconded with the key to his toilet."⁸

Unfortunately, this entire pack of lunatics was Jewish.

(As an aside, I wish to point out that these are the sort of ideologues and misfits who comprise the faculties of Arts and Sciences at all of our elite universities. One example is the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard which expelled President Larry Summers for daring even to propose subjecting Marxist dogma to scientific testing. Another example is "The Group of 88" at Duke University which instituted a media lynching of three men falsely accused of raping a Black streetwalker. The real reason for the attack on these men is that they committed the four sins of being male, white, middle class, and athletes. In episodes at both Harvard and Duke, it is my guess that a disproportionately large number of these faculty members are Judeofascists.)

The Communist leadership in Moscow was at this time hoping for worldwide revolution. Therefore, events in Bavaria were important to them. Moscow felt that Germany, and then France and Italy, would fall to Communism very shortly. Given the importance of Bavaria in this scheme of things, orders came from Moscow to replace the group of clowns above with their agent Eugene Levine. This occurred on April 13. A Communist dictatorship was established, and recruitment for a Red army began.⁹ These were serious Communists, who did not let details such as the will of the people get in the way of establishing utopia on earth. However, it was not to be. An amalgam of regular army forces and Freikorps ended the event as well as the lives of most of those involved.

Germany was becoming stable. The Weimar Republic was about to begin its short and tragic history.

Hungary

In the middle of Europe, surrounded by a sea of Indo-European-speaking peoples, is the land of Hungary. Its people are relative latecomers to Europe, and speak a Turkic-based language. They are a proud people, unwilling to be ruled by outsiders. However, in 1526, Hungary fell, by marriage, to the Hapsburg (Austrian) dynasty.¹⁰ The Hapsburgs gave considerable autonomy to the Hungarian nobility, who actually ruled Hungary. Of all the peoples of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Hungarians were the most independent. To that end, they did not accept the suzerainty of the emperor quâ emperor; they accepted his rule only as “King of Hungary.”

The First World War ended. As noted above, the Austro-Hungarian Empire had been the glue holding together a polyglot and multinational population. With the end of the war, the glue evaporated, literally overnight. Millions of people had to figure out to what nation they now belonged. The confusion that arrived in November of 1918 is still not resolved at the onset of the twenty-first century. The attempt to create fair and acceptable borders for the Hungarians, as well as the other peoples, was complicated by the mixture of races, especially at the border areas. The Hungary that finally emerged in the early 1920s was considerably reduced in size from what might have been expected due to multiple political reasons.¹¹

The intricacies of interwar European politics are far too complex to be addressed as such. I will mention them only as is necessary in the course of general exposition. We will return to a consideration of Hungary. The postwar government was conditioned by the events of the late nineteenth century. Hungary came of political age under the influence of German Socialism:

Socialism was brought to Hungary in 1860’s literally in the knapsacks of itinerant Hungarian, Austrian, Bohemian, and German journeymen who had been exposed to the ideas of Ferdinand Lassal and Karl Marx while learning their trades in Germany. On February 23, 1868, these men founded the first politically motivated group of Budapest proletariat, the General Workers’ Association...Socially, the preponderance of foreign-born skilled workers and immigrant Jewish craftsmen in the first Hungarian workingman’s associations made such groups appear as distinctly alien phenomena, and hence of dubious value in a xenophobic country.¹²

Hungary was largely an agricultural country in the 1860s. But by 1918, there had been enough industrialization for the creation of “a relatively small but politically and culturally conscious urban middle class made up of impoverished gentry, Hungarian and German craftsmen, and recent Jewish immigrants from Galicia.”¹³ That the ideas of Socialism had become sufficiently widespread is given strength by the almost bloodless devolution of power upon the moderate Count Mihaly Karoli following the end of World War I. He was willing to consider a Socialist government, coupled with land redistribution, as the most accommodating solution to the demands of the varied interests of the population.¹⁴ Added to the problems of internal administration, there were external problems consequent to the collapse of the empire. The question of borders with the Czechs to the north and the Romanians to the east led to open warfare. One of the

long-term consequences of this struggle was the loss of Transylvania to Hungary. An immediate consequence of the confusion was the takeover of the government by a Communist-dominated minority on March 21, 1919. The leadership was almost entirely Jewish: the dictatorial power rested with Bela Kun (Kohn), and the Red Army was commanded by Matyas Rakosi (Rosenkrantz).¹⁵ There was a special squad of roaming hooligans used to terrorize the people. Its leader was Tibor Szamuely, and its members were called "Lenin's Boys." The Communist regime was hoping for support from the Soviet Union, but the Russian Revolutionaries were involved in their own fight against the Whites. Thus the Hungarian Republic had to fight alone against its own internal enemies, as well as the Romanian armies still active in the field.

This Communist domination was bloody, brutal, and brief. The end came for the Hungarian Communists when Budapest fell to the Romanians. With the support of the French, an army of counterrevolutionaries under the command of (Hungarian) Admiral Horthy took control of Hungary and purged the country of Communists and Communist allies. The Horthy regime, however, was broad enough to include some anti-Communist, Socialist elements. One of these was Gyula Gombos, who stated that Hungarian Socialism did not require expropriation of all private property and that Hungarian Socialism aimed at preserving personal initiative. His assessment of the flaws of Marxist Communism were prescient: "Marx's state, in the final analysis, will be nothing but a bureaucratic state, without any dynamism [and] full of boring people who are nothing but lifeless parts of a great social machine."¹⁶

Following the defeat of the Hungarian Soviet Republic, the surviving Communists fled to Austria or Russia. Bela Kun fled to Russia, where he was a victim of one of Stalin's purges. The Frankenstein effect again.

Meanwhile, Horthy's regime continued to rule without interference until 1940, when Nazi Germany pressured the regime into an alliance. Horthy was not enthusiastic about the alliance, but had to choose between acquiescence or outright German takeover. Just before the final stages of the war, the Nazis did take over the direct rule of Hungary.¹⁷ However, the collapse of the German armies made the takeover brief. Some of the Hungarian Communists who had fled to the USSR survived Stalin's purges. They came riding back into Hungary on the tanks of the Red Army. Again they were led by Jews: Erno Gero and Matyas Rakosi. (Again. Like a bad penny.) This time, although no less dedicated to total control, they were much more subtle:

In the early postwar period the miniscule Communist party under Muscovite (generic term for the returning Communists) leadership advocated a coalition government, praised the principle of democracy, and preached the necessity of collaborating with the Catholic Church. The Muscovites publicly extolled the bourgeois and peasant leaders of the coalition as progressive and reliable democrats who were entitled to share leadership of the country.¹⁸

In addition to deception, they also were cunning enough to distribute land to the peasants, but they were sure to make the allotments too small for successful farming. Thus they were able to impose collective farming as a necessary measure to "save" the peasants. Hillary Clinton, take notice!

In a few years the façade of liberalism was gone, to be replaced by tyranny. It is important to note the method by which this tyranny was instituted. The police state was empowered by a corrupt court system:

The power of the police increased by the establishment of People's Courts. This was one of the first institutions introduced in all countries under Soviet occupation. The activities of these courts contributed considerably to the creation of an atmosphere of fear, intimidation, and insecurity.¹⁹

We have only to remember the “courts” during the Reign of Terror in Revolutionary France or the legal system in Nazi Germany to realize the power of a corrupt judicial system. That is a prime reason why, in the U.S., we need to rein in the tendency for liberals to use the court system to injure the body politic.

Hungary had the misfortune of suffering Communism twice. For all its misfortunes, Poland suffered only one Communist episode.

Poland

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Poland as a nation did not exist. The Polish-speaking people were territorially split among Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia. They became an independent nation only at the conclusion of World War I as a consequence of the breakup of the three empires above. During the late nineteenth century, racial and ethnic identities became a more prominent feature of European thinking. The people of Poland were no exception. Thus in Poland the “other” status of Jews became more pronounced. One of the chief counters to Polish nationalism was Marxism, which could be defined as “antinationalism.” This was perhaps the most widespread secular Jewish response to Polish ethnic nationalism. As a result of this unfortunate concatenation of attitudes, there was much collusion between some Jews and the Russian invaders of Poland in 1939 and again in 1945. An article addressing this issue is so on point that I will let it speak for itself. In 1999 there was a meeting between Poles and Jews at the Holocaust Museum to address the Polish-Jewish relationship. For the first time that I know of, the Polish point of view was expressed in an academic setting in the U.S. Addressing the Soviet-Nazi joint invasion of Poland in 1939, Ewa Thompson states:

The deportations of one and a half million Poles—mostly Catholic—to the Soviet Gulag traumatized the entire Polish nation and that happened before the Shoah [*italics in original*]. Polish children were starved and gassed, Polish parents were taken to Germany and worked to death as forced laborers. The nation was brutalized to the point which I am afraid would have been incomprehensible to secure middle-class Americans even if they learned about it from textbooks which they have not, for this section of history has been excised from American memory as well. Have we ever heard from Jewish organizations any words of sympathy for the unspeakable tragedy, suffering and losses that befell the Jews' Polish brethren in World War II...Between three and four million Polish Christians were killed during World War II by two sides, Nazis and Soviets. In a book entitled *Maus*, a Jewish cartoonist, Art Spiegelman, presented Polish people in World War II as secure pigs, who looked indifferently at Jewish suffering. That such a racist and mendacious book is taught in American schools and universities today is a great injustice to Poles. And this is happening today, even as we speak, and not in some remote point in the past; and it is perpetrated by educated and supposedly responsible people, teachers

and university professors. This book is also prominently displayed in the Houston Holocaust Museum's bookstore.

In spite of the terror imposed on Poland in World War II, there was no systematic collaboration with the Nazis. None. Zero. There were no SS units composed of Poles. There was in Poland no Vichy government. You cannot find any document written by any member of the Polish Government or the underground resistance that condones or encourages turning in Jews to the Nazis. This was rather exceptional in Nazi-occupied Europe, but it has been elbowed out of American Jewish memory.

The third segment of Polish history which needs correction in American Jewish memory has to do with the Polish-Jewish relations under the Soviet occupation in 1939–41 and again, in the decade following World War II [emphasis in original]. A book published by Princeton University Press and titled *Revolution from Abroad: the Soviet Conquest of Poland's Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia*, says that when the Soviet army attacked in September, 1939, it was met, consistently and repeatedly, by friendly Jewish crowds. After these greetings there took place arrests, executions and deportations to the Gulag of persons who were predominantly Polish and Catholic. Poles expect the responsible members of the Jewish community to recognize that there took place in the first two years of World War II and after the war, a massive collaboration of Jewish Poles with the Soviet occupiers, a collaboration which contributed to numerous Polish Christian deaths and family tragedies. Joseph Stalin appointed Jakub Berman as the virtual dictator of Poland between 1945–1953. How many Polish Christian lives did Jakub Berman waste, only God knows. Sources speak of 30,000 Polish patriots who were arrested and killed under his supervision. Have we ever heard any Jewish organization condemn Jakub Berman and express sympathy to Poles who suffered under his terror for nine long years?²⁰

The above passage is truly a cry from the heart. The only thing I could add to it is the failure of the Jewish community to address as well the similar situations in Russia, the Ukraine, Germany, and Hungary.

1 Rudolf Coper, *Failure of a Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), 18.

2 Arno Schirokauer, *Lassalle: The Power of Illusion and the Illusion of Power*, trans. by Eden and Cedar Paul (New York: The Century Co., 1932), 259.

3 *Ibid.*, 260–261.

4 Gordon A Craig, *Germany: 1866–1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 400.

5 Coper, 197–230.

6 Richard Grunberg, *Red Tide Rising in Bavaria* (London, Arthur Barker, Ltd., 1973), 33.

7 *Ibid.*, 37.

8 Craig, 411.

9 Craig, 411.

10 A.J.P. Taylor, *The Habsburg Monarchy, 1809–1918* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976), 11.

11 *Ibid.*, 253.

12 Rudolf L. Tokes, *Bela Kun and the Hungarian Soviet Republic* (Stanford, CA: F.A. Praeger, 1967), 15.

13 *Ibid.*, 16.

14 Corvinus Library. Bela K. Kiraly, *Atlantic Studies on Society in Change*, no. 108 (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), sv “The Aster Revolution,” www.hungarian-history.hu

15 Answers.com: Oxford University Press. sv “Bela Kun”; “Matyas Rokasi.”

16 Corvinus Library. Chapt. 6: *Refugee Participation in the Revolution and Counterrevolution, October 1918–August 1919*. www.hungarian-history.hu

17 *Ibid.*, sv “Postwar Hungary.”

18 *Ibid.*, sv “Postwar Hungary.”

19 *Ibid.*, sv “Postwar Hungary.”

20 Ewe Thompson, *Sarmatian Review*. Vol. XIX.1 (1999).

CHAPTER 28

THE TIDE TURNS

I. Business

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the thinking of leaders in American business and education began to change. The change paralleled that seen in the Protestant religion among the New England elite. As far as education is concerned, this is not surprising, as the leaders in education were largely from the same class as the business elite. Among American businessmen the change seems to have occurred in the children of the “robber barons” rather than in the persons of the founding generation itself. I do not know the reason(s) for the change, but I do know that this is one thing that cannot be blamed on the Jews.

America was blessed not to have a stable, hereditary aristocratic class. One became important on the basis of achievement, and no field of endeavor was as well respected as business. Our great nation came into existence with the Industrial Revolution and grew great because of it. Railways knit the country together through trade, and telegraphy allowed the transmission of data that guided the flow of commodities. Through the miracle of freedom under law, we developed the greatest nation the world has ever seen. It could not have been done in the absence of free trade, of the fortuitous concatenation of a new continent, of the Industrial Revolution, and of English cultural heritage. If the colonization of North America had occurred a century earlier, lack of communications would have doomed us to the centrifugal forces that afflict Central and South America. If we had been colonized under a tyrannical Spanish aristocracy and the intolerant Roman Catholic Church of the Inquisition, our liberty would not exist. We are who we are only

by grace of a confluence of events that are unique in the history of civilization. We must not lose this miracle!

John D. Rockefeller

There were men willing and able to take advantage of what the new Republic offered. In the process of enriching themselves, they enriched us all. Many were not nice people; in many instances the term “robber barons” is very close to the truth. John D. Rockefeller (1839–1937) was one of these men. He was in a good place at a good time: Cleveland, Ohio. “This mystic union of coal, iron, and fire was to raise on the banks of the little Cuyahoga [River] immense furnaces, rolling mills, and factories, whose chimneys would darken the sky of the city before the Civil War began.”¹ It was certainly true that soot blackened the skies of Cleveland and Pittsburgh. But Rockefeller was interested in the “burning fluid” (coal oil) that allowed people to light their homes and streets. He began to acquire oil wells in Ohio and Pennsylvania. This was the beginning of a vast empire of oil holding and refining. The advent of the automobile increased profitability and power geometrically. Rockefeller was like a shark in business. He destroyed his competition by means fair and foul. The history of these events is well known.

Andrew Carnegie

Another Protestant, Andrew Carnegie (1835–1919), was born in Scotland, but migrated to the U.S. as a boy. He eventually became the owner of the largest steel trust in the world. He, too, was ruthless, both to competitors and to labor. However, what makes his story unusual is that he considered himself a radical, even a Socialist.² Considering his political views, it is ironic that he was in control of Carnegie Steel during the Homestead Strike of 1892. Pinkerton Guards were brought in, and when they failed to break the strike, the governor of Pennsylvania brought in the state militia. The union representing the steelworkers was broken, but at great cost: twelve men died at the onset of the strike, and after four months of inactivity, the striking workers were destitute and returned to work. During the strike, Carnegie was in Scotland, where he had made himself inaccessible to everyone except Henry Frick. Henry Frick was his partner and was in charge of the entire business during Carnegie’s absence. Now, it was known that Frick was hostile to labor and that Carnegie had given Frick a blank check to do whatever was necessary to settle the strike by breaking the union.³ Historians debate whether Carnegie’s absence and isolation were deliberate. In any event, Carnegie was accessible to Frick by cable twenty-four hours per day.

In the case of the oil and steel cartels, both Rockefeller and Carnegie argued the advantages of economy of scale in support of their respective monopolies. Rockefeller was also able to argue that the precipitous price drops due to oil oversupply could only be dealt with by monopoly. In fact, at one point, the price of oil was so low “that the wooden barrel was worth almost twice as much as its contents”!⁴ It is true that there was chaos in the production and refining of oil, and that price stability was obtained, but at what cost?

General Case

In a sense, these and other monopolies foreshadowed state Socialism, because what is the difference between a state-owned enterprise and an enterprise that eventually becomes subject to severe state regulation? In fact, Carnegie advocated such late in his life.⁵ Also,

from the point of view of a central government, it is far easier to control a single large business than a host of small ones. It is also easier to shear one giant sheep than a flock of small sheep at tax time. Hillary Clinton demonstrated her awareness of this situation in her comment: "I can't go out and save every undercapitalized entrepreneur in America."⁶

I discussed Rockefeller and Carnegie because they were the two most important and well-known entrepreneurs of the era of rapid industrialization. There were many more, such as Jay Gould, Collis Huntington, Leland Stanford, E. H. Harriman, and William Randolph Hearst. What they had in common was the creation of large enterprises that they personally owned and controlled. At the present time, most large enterprises are controlled by diverse shareholders through joint-stock companies, and thus the businesses lack the imprint of the personality of the original founder. Most of today's large businesses are run by university-trained MBAs who are essentially glorified technocrats. They have all had essentially the same training. In France, this training is called formation. In German it is called Bildung. Let us look at these words. Formation relates clearly at the English term formation. Bildung is related to the English term building. Both of these foreign terms give us a clearer appreciation of the limitations to be expected in the minds of these private sector bureaucrats. After such "formation" are they still able to think independently? These terms also warn us that these managers have little to gain by resisting government encroachment. In fact, they could work in government just as easily as in private industry. After all, a bureaucrat is a bureaucrat is a bureaucrat. That tells us something about the ease with which big business has accepted racial preferences and a host of other "politically correct" government policies.

The Heirs

What sort of people followed these pioneers? Study the careers of the children of the Kennedys, the Rockefellers, and the Harrimans. They became liberals; they followed the power as it travelled from Wall Street to Washington during the New Deal. Opportunists, that's what sort of people they are.

II Education

Popular

Although this section on education and the following one on religion are written in the form of biographical sketches, I will use the studies of these individuals to demonstrate how their ideas shaped the culture of their times. Their influence is still felt today.

Horace Mann (1796–1859) is the first man who might be called a student of education in U.S. history. Living at a time when education was haphazard, he began the process of giving primary education its current structure. It was he who championed free, compulsory, and universal public education. He also founded the first teachers' colleges in the U.S.

Some of the imprints of his personal beliefs and those of many of his academic contemporaries are seen grafted onto the primitive educational establishment of his time. First, Mann disbelieved in free will.⁷ As a determinist, he believed in the perfectibility of man.⁸ However, perfection could not be achieved by leaving control of education in the hands of the masses. Educational policy was to be directed mainly toward character development; literacy and mathematics were necessary, but secondary.⁹ Accordingly,

parental involvement in school policy was not encouraged.¹⁰ Since character formation is so important, it must be left to the moral and intellectual elite; it is beyond the scope of the common man. Proof of this is that the common man believed in revealed religion: a clear indication of intellectual failing.¹¹ It was his desire to mold society by control of education.¹² He and his type would be only too happy to provide the mold.

Mann hated competition:

His family and that of another...shared the expense of renting a bowling alley...Mann agreed to the arrangement, but only on the condition that the facility would be used solely for individual exercise and recreation. No games were to be played in which there were contestants whose scores could be compared. Rather than be exposed to the temptation of competition and emulation, Mann insisted that each person in either family be allowed to exercise his or her muscles without any reference to what the muscles of another had accomplished.¹³

What sort of person was Mann? Messerli describes him thus:

He knew he was right and, like a Grand Inquisitor, he would not grant his opponents the same indulgence. One searches in vain for any admission either that his ideology was in error or his efforts ill-conceived. He knew what society needed and how to accomplish it. Writing to a correspondent he would say, "now where social institutions are not widely established, or where the manners and customs, and the tone of feeling that pervade society, among a people whose law is public opinion, are wrong, then the machinery is out of order, and those who can both perceive how it is, and how it should be, are commissioned to set to right."¹⁴

A contemporary critic accused him promoting "liberal goals...by illiberal means."¹⁵ It should surprise no one that he took as his model the Prussian educational system. The modern educational Mafia rightly claims him as their role model.¹⁶

Elite

While Horace Mann set the tone for popular education, Endicott Peabody (1857–1944) laid out the lesson plan for the elite. In 1883, a group of New England's elite came together to found a new private school in Connecticut. In that year Phillips Brooks, Wm. Lawrence, Wm. C. Endicott, James Lawrence, J. P. Morgan, S.E. Peabody, and Endicott Peabody founded Groton School for Boys.¹⁷ This is where the sons of New England's elite could send their sons preparatory to going to college, i.e., Harvard, Yale, or Princeton. Institutions are established to fill needs. The purpose of Groton was to create a corps of elite young men for public service at the highest levels of government. Other schools could prepare young men for more pedestrian careers in business, law, or medicine. Endicott Peabody had studied at Cambridge University in England and wanted to create a similar institution for training elite young Americans. As in the case of Mann, the mastery of the curriculum was secondary to the building of character. One difference, however, was that the students at Groton came to Groton fully aware of its educational philosophy. In the public sector, the student and his family were the unwitting subjects of state indoctrination.

Peabody had a strong sense of Christianity, without being overly concerned with dogma. He had come from a Unitarian family, but the spiritual sterility of Unitarian practice left

him unsatisfied, hence he became Episcopalian. His faith was deep, and it was mixed with a strong sense of moral rectitude. What was pronounced in his faith, in contrast to the earlier Puritans, was his concern with morality in the public sphere. He refused to limit religious obligation to the personal relationship between God and man. It will be from this, as we will see, that internationalist and interventionist U.S. proclivities of the post-WW II mentality will spring, that is, from a misplaced sense of noblesse oblige. He was a strong believer in family and tradition. The two beliefs in internationalism and traditionalism were bound to eventually conflict.

The graduates of his school were strong enough to shape U.S. foreign and domestic policy. Under people like Franklin Roosevelt, Averill Harriman, and Dean Acheson, it was bound to lead us, as a nation, down a road to tragic involvement in what can only be described as an updated version of “the white man’s burden.” An attempt to transplant democracy to parts of the world to which it is alien betrays on our part a form of cultural imperialism. In domestic affairs, too, it encouraged a sense of superiority on the part of a small elite over the (presumed) limited capacity of the masses. Its domestic imperialism may have been less blunt than that of Mann, but it was no less arrogant. It will be tragic, when, in the last quarter of the twentieth century the forces of Mann and Peabody will merge to nurture a formidable beast called Political Correctness.

III Religion

The belief system of the elite influences the masses. During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the business and cultural center of the country was still in the Northeast corridor from New England through New York to Washington, DC. Protestantism was the dominant religion in the U.S. The Protestant religion of the elite in New England and New York was to have an impact far in excess of the numbers of its adherents due to the influence of this elite on the institutions of culture and government. The impact was (and is) continuous and cumulative, rather than immediate and overwhelming.

By 1820 the Unitarian faith was the “religion of record” in Boston. It had come to dominate Harvard and the Boston Ministerial Association.¹⁸ Since the Unitarian “confession” could consist of whatever one wished, or nothing at all, its adherents were left with no moral compass. Numerous other Protestant denominations have taken the same road, although maintaining a tenuous connection to Christian Gospel. One could suspend belief while still holding membership in a confessing domination. So we have similar minds in diverse denominations. But the need for meaning was universal. As Kant pointed out, one cannot believe in nothing, so we will see Unitarians taking three main directions: (1) Social Darwinism, (2) Philosophical religion, and (3) Socialism quâ Social Gospel.

If Darwin was right, and man is the high point of evolution, one could presume evolution would continue in a progressive way:

It is Darwinism which has placed Humanity upon a higher pinnacle than ever. The future is lighted for us in the radiant colors of hope. Strife and sorrow shall disappear. Peace and love shall reign supreme. The dream of poets, the lesson of priest and prophet, the inspiration of the great musician, is confirmed in the light of modern knowledge; and as we gird ourselves up for the work of life, we may look forward to the time when in the

truest sense the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever, king of kings and lord of lords. (John Fiske)¹⁹

Along with this unbounded optimism, Darwinism made Christianity subject to the “German Disease,” that is the concept of the changing basis of reality, or, at least the perception thereof. The door was left open for Hegel, and all his successors, one of whom was Karl Marx.

The second philosophical approach is seen in the works of Emerson, the other Transcendentalists, and people such as Mme. Helene Blavatsky, the founder of Theosophy. It also is the way of the Kabbalah. It is frequently referred to as “syncretic” because it attempts to unite diverse elements by determining their underlying unity. Today some of its manifestations are called “New Age” religion.

In modern times this syncretic approach to religion inevitably appealed to those who were fascinated or troubled by the increase of knowledge about other world religions. Emerson and his transcendental friends inspired a revival of serious study of the eastern religions. Later in the century, both in Europe and in America, the alluring message of the Hindu and Buddhist scriptures began to be known—especially after Max Muller’s multivolume edition of Eastern scriptures (1875–1901) became available. Not only did “reincarnation,” “Karma,” and “nirvana” enter the American religious vocabulary, but one or another of the Eastern religions often became an alternative for those who were dissatisfied with or untouched by the more traditional forms of Judeo-Christian religion.²⁰

A third way is best exemplified by citing the work of a typical exponent of Social Gospel. Walter Rauschenbusch (1861–1918) lived during the high point of the Social Gospel movement. He was a professor of theology at Rochester Theological Seminary (currently Colgate Crozier Divinity School) in Rochester, New York. My first quote demonstrates the tie between religion and social action:

This insistence on Christian morality as the only thing God cares about us is of fundamental importance for the question before us... The prophets were the heralds of the fundamental truth that religion and ethics are inseparable, and that ethical conduct is the supreme and sufficient religious act. If that principle had been fully adopted in our religious life, it would have turned the full force of the religious impulse into the creation of right moral conduct and would have made the unchecked growth and accumulation of injustice impossible.²¹

The tie to the “social” is shown by Rauschenbusch’s belief in the discredited “labor theory of value,”²² and the statement “If we want approximate political equality, we must have approximate economic equality.”²³ There is the usual complaint that the extremes of wealth and poverty are great and becoming greater.²⁴ I cannot think of one liberal democrat since FDR who has not made that claim, yet it was not true in 1916, and it is not true in 2008, or in all the intervening years.

As this chapter ends, I want to make clear that the sequence just related above of progression from Calvinism to Unitarianism to Social Darwinism to Philosophical Religion to Social Gospel was not a necessary progression. None of these belief systems

is predicated on the prior existence of the others. It was the peculiar events of the American Experience that explains them and their sequence.

1 Allan Nevins, John D. Rockefeller: The Heroic Age of American Enterprise, vol. I (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940), 80.

2 Joseph Frazier Wall, Andrew Carnegie (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1970), 132, 429, 430, 968–969.

3 Wall, 542.

4 Nevins, vol. I, 584.

5 Wall, 968–969.

6 Pittsburgh Tribune Gazette, July 16, 2007. Citing Hillary Clinton's 1993 remark.

7 Jonathan Messerli, Horace Mann: A Biography (New York: Alfred A. Knop, 1972), 214.

8 Ibid., 211.

9 Ibid., 264.

10 Ibid., 244.

11 Ibid., 244.

12 Ibid., 247.

13 Ibid., 569.

14 Ibid., 337.

15 Ibid., 570.

16 Ibid., 339.

17 Frank D. Ashburn, Peabody of Groton (New York: Coward McCann, Inc., 1944), 68.

18 Sydney E. Ahlstrom, A Religious History of the American People (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), 396–397.

19 Ibid., 771.

20 Ibid., 1041.

21 Walter Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Crisis (London: McMillan and Co. Ltd, 1916), 7.

22 Ibid., 237.

23 Ibid., 263.

24 Ibid., 249.

CHAPTER 29

FLOOD TIDE

Le silence éternel des espaces infinis m'effraie.

(The eternal silence of infinite space terrifies me.)

—Blaise Pascal

In this, the last chapter on the declension of American Protestantism, I will show it to have arrived at the “God is dead” stage. I will use primarily the work of Episcopal Bishop John Spong to illustrate at what point we have arrived at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Firstly and appropriately, Mr. Spong tells us what he does not believe. He lists the five fundamentals of Reform Protestant religion which he denies:¹

1. The inspiration of Scripture as the literal, revealed word of God.
2. The virgin birth as the miraculous and literal means by which the divine nature of Christ has been guaranteed.
3. The substitutionary view of the atonement that was accomplished in the death of Jesus. The affirmation of the saving power of his blood and the gift of salvation that was accomplished by his death.
4. The certainty of the physical bodily resurrection of Jesus from the dead. The accuracy of both the empty-tomb and the appearance stories in the gospel tradition.
5. The truth of the second coming of Jesus, the reality of the Day of Judgment, which would be based on the record of one’s life, and the certainty of heaven and hell as eternal places of one’s reward and punishment.

He does not accept God as a supernatural being; he does not believe that God interferes with human existence, or with any natural phenomenon.² He states that he is not a theist, which is pretty clear from the preceding. But he denies that he is an atheist. However, by functional definition, most people would consider him so. But how one defines one’s personal belief system is just that: personal. His belief system would fail many people, inadequate to answer the most common human needs, at least for those of us in the West. An eloquent quote from Pascal (Blaise Pascal, 1623–1662, French Philosopher) expresses these needs:

We flounder in vast waters, always uncertain and floating, tossed here and there. Whatever support we hope to find is insecure and leaves us; and if we pursue it, it eludes our grasp, and continuously glides away from us, forever evading us; nothing waits for us. This is our natural state, but one most alien to our desire. We burn with the desire to find a firm and constant base, upon which to build a tower to the heavens, but our very foundation cracks, and the earth splits open beneath us.³

Let us look at the alternative Bishop Spong offers us:

Ultimately we discover that our God-experience is like swimming in an eternal ocean of love. It is also like interacting with the unperceived presence of the air. We breathe love in, and we breathe love out. It is omnipresent, omniscient, omnipotent. It is never exhausted, always expanding. When I try to describe this reality, words fail me; so I simply utter the name God. That name, however, is no longer for me the name of a being—not even a supernatural being or the supreme being. It is not the title for a

miracle-worker, a magician or a rescuer. It is rather something as nebulous and yet as real as a holy presence. It is a symbol of that which is immortal, invisible, timeless.⁴

I have taken this quote from his book *A New Christianity for a New World*. The subtitle is *Why Traditional Faith is Dying and How a New Faith is Being Born*. William James, in his work *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, cites a passage printed in 1901 on “Cosmic Consciousness” which is almost verbatim what Spong gives us above. What Spong is saying is hardly “new.” If we really wanted to trace it down, his thought processes would take us back to Boehme, Fichte, and Hegel. Not only is it not new, it is hackneyed in comparison to the far better prose of the classic mystical religious writers.

What Spong offers would not be far removed from any of a number of Eastern traditions. However, the Eastern traditions such as Buddhism, Hinduism, Taoism, and Confucianism come from cultures in which they are deeply grounded, and of which they are a longstanding part. Spong offers “New Age” thought to a flock that is unreceptive. He acknowledges that he is speaking to a small minority: “At its core, this group will be a small minority of the population, but they will be augmented by a much larger group of fellow travelers.”⁵ At the same time he faults the mainline churches for failing to meet the needs of the people, and notes that they are losing congregants as a consequence. He fails to notice a simple and profound truth: the people are not leaving the mainline churches; the mainline churches are leaving the people. It is his arrogance, and the arrogance of his “fellow travelers,” that assures him that he is a modern-day Moses who can decide for the masses what they should and should not believe. The principle difference between him and his ilk as compared to similar mystical writers noted by William James in the chapter, “Mysticism in Varieties of Religious Experience,” is that the nineteenth-century mystics were not evangelically driven to take control of the thought processes of the benighted masses. That is, they lacked the arrogance of Spong, et al. I say this in order to shield mystics, happy in their beliefs but not seeking to destroy the belief systems of others.

Having eliminated God from any role in human affairs, Spong has given to Caesar what is Caesar’s, and to Caesar what is God’s. Caesar has become omnipotent: Church and State are one. Now we can go to the Political Correctness police for uniform enforcement. They know what to do: group rights, such as racial preferences. Increase taxation of the rich to fund utopian giveaway programs to those who choose not to work. The assignment of “victim status” upon everyone who is not a white male. Gutting freedom of speech by banning “hate speech” (to be defined by the Left).

Enforcement is the real issue. During the Spanish Inquisition, priests determined who was a heretic. But the Church itself did not burn the heretics at the stake. They turned them over to the secular authorities for execution. So it is with the mainline churches. They depend upon the forces of the state to redistribute wealth, to create a whole new category of “hate crimes,” to implement group rights, forced busing, and a host of other depredations upon a free people. In this the Spongs are like their Puritan forbearers in their arrogant intolerance of any who might question their goodness—or their power.

It is useful to look for a moment at who these people are. Most of them come from wealthy East Coast Protestant establishment families. Many have gone to Ivy League colleges and have had no real contact with people who actually work for a paycheck. But

they are no strangers to the semiliterate young Negroes they have fished out of ghettos to place in elite schools. These token Negroes have the job of being angry and of reminding these clerics that they, too, are the recipients of white privilege. This white liberal guilt has now become the “original sin” for the “WASPS.” In the field of religion, little disappears;—it just takes on new guises. These elite themselves frequently have trust funds and hold secured positions in well-endowed churches; therefore they need self-imposed scourges like token Negroes or waspy feminists to assuage their sense of guilt. There has been a strange but direct evolution from Jonathan Edwards (Sinners in the hands of an angry God) to sinners by virtue of race, class, and gender. Plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose. (The more it changes, the more it is the same thing.)

The truly noble and honest action for these clerics would be to leave the church. It is hypocrisy to remain in clerical garb. But to leave the church...to leave the cushy job, the pension plan, the adoring looks of fellow-travelers...that is a lot to ask. It might mean having to get a real job to supplement the trust fund income.

These men and women would be ridiculous, they would be pitiful, they would be marginal, they would be an embarrassment...except that they have power. They are connected to the foundations, the universities, the large corporations, and the highest levels of government. They are dangerous to a free society. We ignore them at our peril.

1 John S. Spong, *A New Christianity for a New World* (San Francisco: HarperCollins Co., 2001), 2.

2 *Ibid.*, 3–4.

3 Blasé Pascal, *Pensées* (extraits), trans. by author (Paris: Nouveaux Classiques Larousse: Imprimerie Larousse, 1965), 113.

4 Spong, 71.

5 Spong, 17.

CHAPTER 30

MORE GERMAN JEWS

The Frankfurt School

Herman Weil was a Prussian Jewish millionaire who made his money in the free enterprise system. He was a major shipper of grain from Argentina to Europe at the beginning of the twentieth century. He was personally known to Kaiser Wilhelm II, who consulted him regarding the German war effort. The kaiser “liked the optimism and certainty of victory in his reports.” He advised the kaiser to initiate submarine warfare. “His role in the war as ‘father of submarine warfare’ was in the end seen to have been disastrous.”¹ We have another iteration of Joseph helping Pharaoh. Two points are key here: firstly, Weil made his money in the free-market system, and, secondly, he tried to be of help to the autocratic German state. He had a son named Felix who became a dilettante in art, and a “patron of the left.” This history is so common among Jews that it is the norm. However, while most run-of-the-mill Jewish Communists produced moderate harm to society, Felix Weil was truly in the big leagues. Using some of the

money of the family fortune, he established an institute in Frankfurt, Germany. This occurred immediately after the close of WW I. Its purpose was to promote Marxism and work for the eventual triumph of Communism in the world. The use of money made in the free-market system to destroy the free-market system should have a name. I will call it the “Soros Phenomenon.”

The question of naming the Institute shows some deception: Weil originally was going to include Marxism in the title, but decided to use the more innocuous title “Institute for Social Research.” It was run “as a dictatorship of the director.” “In our Institute, it seems to me that sharing the directorship, especially with individuals of other ideological or methodological viewpoints, is quite out of the question.”² We will see this recur decades later when the personnel of the Institute flee to the United States. It is currently called “political correctness,” but is more accurately called left-wing fascism.

It was not coincidence alone that led the Institute to Frankfurt: “a city which had the highest percentage of Jews in the population of any German town and the best known and, after Berlin, the second largest Jewish community.”³ It also had a Socialist city government and had a long history of having been a “free” city, that is, a politically independent entity in what had been a fractured German-speaking mass of small states. The Institute was accepted as a department within Frankfurt University, because the Institute offered to endow a professorial chair at the university. Money was scarce after WW I, so this financial bait worked. The Institute itself was financially independent, which gave the university an added department at no expense. As it paid its own way, the Institute was free of university meddling.⁴

At the time the Institute was founded, it was clearly Marxist-Communist. One of its founding professors, Carl Grunberg, stated “Marxism will now have a home.”⁵ The founder, Felix Weil, was clear regarding his hope for the future of his Institute; “ ‘Weil’s heartfelt wish,’ recalled Rosa Meyer-Levine, ‘was still to create a foundation similar to the Marx-Engels Institute in Moscow—equipped with a staff of professors and students, with libraries and archives—and one day present it to a German Soviet Republic.’ ” It would turn out that the description of the Institute would eventually describe the state of affairs on the campuses of the elite American universities at the end of the twentieth century.

The progress of the Institute in Frankfurt was cut short by the advent of Hitler. But Weil had enough foresight to transfer the assets of the Institute to Switzerland. This gave him the leverage necessary to transfer the Institute to Columbia University in New York, under arrangements similar to those at Frankfurt University.

As we will see in the chapter entitled Anschluss, the Jewish Left infiltrates American society by using “cofactors.” These cofactors are usually WASP leftists or fellow-travelers. In the case of the Institute, it was Robert S. Lynd, a radical professor of sociology at Columbia. Behind the scenes, he pulled the right strings to get a favorable decision from the president of the university.⁶ It was also (again!) helpful that the Institute could fund itself.

Now we look at the rats that fled the sinking ship. Who came to the U.S. with and from the Institute? I will list some of their names: Franz Neumann, Karl Mannheim, Otto Kirchheim, Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer, and last but not least, Herbert Marcuse.

These men were all Jews, and mostly, if not entirely, Marxists. They came to the U.S., and oddly, a number of them found work with the OSS, the precursor of the CIA. That was because they were anti-Nazi. That they were anti-American was determined only when it was too late. The OSS veterans, joined by the others, subsequently found work in the U.S. university system. The evil they accomplished is seen on the campuses today with the fascistic restrictions on freedom of speech and the Marxist indoctrination so common in the social sciences and humanities. Of all of the ills perpetrated by the Jewish Left on the U.S., this one is at once the worst and the least visible. Thus it is the most insidious.

German Jewish Jurists

One way of looking at the nature of law is to divide it into two basic types. Positive laws consist of statutes passed by the state. The law is valid because it is an expression of the state (or whoever controls the state). The question of whether or not the law is “fair” or “moral” or in accord of an abstract concept of justice does not apply. The law is valid because the state has brought it into existence. The other form of law is called “natural law” because it is presumed to come from a higher source of unimpeachable stature. A classic example of natural law would be the second paragraph of our Declaration of Independence which reads: “We declare these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.” An example of positive law would be the 1933 Nuremberg Laws of Nazi Germany denying Jews civil rights in the Third Reich.

I will present here a brief sketch of the evolution of these two kinds of law in the West. The law on the continent of Europe goes back to codes of law first introduced by the Roman Empire. It was easier to rule masses of subject peoples by promulgating a one-size-fits-all code to cover a vast heterogeneous (multicultural?) empire. Many other codes were promulgated in limited areas of Europe, but the principle went back to the Roman model. The next major code of law was the Napoleonic Code that applied to France and to all the territories under French bayonets. With the fall of Napoleon, the various disparate legal systems that predated the Code were reinstated. But slowly, the advantage of a uniform Code that gave all citizens equal status before the law, while at the same time preserving the supremacy of the state, became too tempting for statist to resist. Therein, dear Reader, lies the reason positive law is so loved by the Jewish Left. Positive law is the right hand of the autocrat, and the Jewish Left has always been partial to autocrats.

But our concern here is limited to German law. Regarding the evolution of German law, the English jurist Leonard Schapiro has this to say: “In the absence of common law, the source of validity of the law for the rationalists of the German nineteenth century became the state; and the dominant doctrine in German law, right up to the advent of National Socialism, was positivism.”⁷

We can now look at specific German Jewish jurists. Our first example is Eduard Gans (1789–1839). He studied under Hegel (this does not bode well). He became a jurist, but discovered that he could not advance without abjuring Judaism, so he became an apostate. Here we see his denial of “particularism” by becoming just like everybody else.

But it was not enough that just he become like everybody else: he concluded that Judaism had “degenerated” because of its isolation. He began an organization to promote “progress” in Jewish thinking (Verein für Kultur und Wissenschaft der Judentum). Boiled down to its essentials, the organization was merely a tool to deconstruct traditional Judaism. It was no different from today’s Reform “Judaism.” Further rewarding him for rejecting particularism, the government promoted him to full professor at Berlin University. 8 (With few exceptions, all university professors were and are state employees in Europe. Who pays the piper calls the tune. If you are a piper, it is a good idea to be on good terms with the payer. The Jewish Left knows this very well.)

More recently, and more ominously, two jurists who helped shape the German legal system were Jews. They played major roles in creating the Rechtsstaat, that is a state with a legal code that is binding just because it an act of the state. It is the quintessence of positive law. The first of these jurists was Georg Jellinek (1851–1911).

Of Jellinek, Schapiro writes:

One can take Georg Jellinek as the most influential exponent of the doctrine [positive law], since he occupied the Chair of Law at Heidelberg, and through the medium of his *Allgemeine Staatslehre* (1900) educated generations of judges and administrators who were active in the Weimar Republic and after. For Jellinek the force of law derives from the fact that it is enacted by the state. But the state at the same time enacts rules which bind itself: it thereby becomes a Rechtsstaat...Now, the obvious weakness of the Rechtsstaat, as we know from bitter experience...is that the state will only remain founded on law as long as it chooses to do so: or to put it another way, that it retains the authority to enact the kind of emergency powers and the like which Hitler used to destroy the tottering Weimar Republic—legislation which, though a travesty of the law, will nevertheless be valid and enforceable 9

Jellinek was immediately followed by another Jewish jurist, Hans Kelsen (1881–1973).

Of Kelsen, Schapiro writes:

For Kelsen, law is a binding norm, and nothing more; it has no ethical or moral content so far as the lawyer is concerned, and its validity derives purely causally from the fact that it is enacted with the power of the state behind it. The positivist Rechtsstaat appeared to Kelsen to be drawing a distinction in favor of the latter between a state based on force and a state based on law: for Kelsen the two are identical, since state and law for him are identical. The state is the sum total of the laws, and the laws are the state in action, the legal order. Every state, therefore, which has a legal order, is of necessity a Rechtsstaat, a state based on law.10

Now Kelsen’s motive for so defining law was with the best of intent: he wanted to clear the road for a benign Socialist system and natural law was not flexible enough for him. For him, law was instrumental in nature, a means to an end.

In the event, Kelsen had to flee the Nazis. His place was taken by a German of Aryan lineage (Carl Schmitt), who took the next logical step and identified the state with one man. And so we have come to the final evolution of law as Rechtsstaat. We were led almost to the end by the Jewish Left, and if we replace the name “Hitler” with “Stalin,” they would have taken us through the last step also. Here is a clear example of the

Frankenstein Effect, in which the creation turns upon the creator. The worst part of the story is yet to come: Kelsen was given a full professorship at the University of California, Berkeley.

Franz Neumann (1900–1954) is unfortunately a good example of another attribute of the Jewish Left: ingratitude. But to study his case, we need to review a little German history. After the German defeat in WW I, the kaiser abdicated, leaving the Reichstag (Parliament) the legitimate government in Germany. Very shortly thereafter, the Communists attempted to hijack the German Revolution, as they had the Russian Revolution. One of the Communist fighters was Neumann.¹¹ Although he and his Communist colleagues failed to install a Communist government, he continued to work for Marxist causes. With the accession to power of the Nazi regime, Neumann wended his way to the U.S. Here he was given asylum and began to work for the Office of Strategic Services, giving him access to Allied war secrets. In savage ingratitude, he began to spy for the Soviet Union.¹² After the end of WW II, Neumann worked with Justice Robert Jackson prosecuting Nazis at the Nuremberg Trials. The defendants claimed they were only following orders, that is, the law as written. Had they had Kelsen as defense counsel, they would have been acquitted.

An irony in Neumann's case is that if the Communists had taken over Germany in 1919, they would in all likelihood have subjected the people to a Red Terror as was the case in Russia. Then Neumann would have been a party to crimes against humanity. Maybe Kelsen would have defended him in the event of a trial.

At about the same time as the Nuremberg Trials, Neumann became a professor of government at Columbia University, and many of his papers are preserved at the Houghton Library at Harvard. Thus his influence went beyond the sphere of law. To make matters worse, the pathology continues into the next generation. One of his sons, Michael, being a red-diaper baby, continues to spew Marxist garbage as a professor of philosophy at Trent University in Ontario, Canada. The contamination continues to spread. The natural habitat of the Jewish Left is the university campus. Unfortunately, they show no sign of becoming an endangered species.

The list of German Jews who came here, only to betray the ideals for which this country stands is very long. I cannot discuss all the people "worthy" of note. I will have to limit our discussion to those who prove relevant to the subject under discussion in future chapters.

1 Rolf Wiggershaus, *The Frankfurt School*, trans. by Michael Robertson (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1995), 12–13.

2 *Ibid.*, 25.

3 *Ibid.*, 17.

4 *Ibid.*, 19.

5 *Ibid.*, 27.

6 *Ibid.*, 144.

7 Leonard Schapiro, *Russian Studies* (New York: Viking-Penguin Inc., 1987), 32.

8 *Encyclopedia Judaica*, 2nd ed. sv Gans, Eduard.

9 Schapiro, 32.

10 *Ibid.*, 33–34.

11 American National Biography Online, Feb. 2000. sv Franz Neumann.

12 Allen Weinstein and Alexander Vassiliev, *The Haunted Wood* (New York: The Modern Library, 1999), 246–250.

CHAPTER 31

ANSCHLUSS

In a previous chapter, I showed the basis of the bond between the Calvinist Puritans and the Jews. This affinity is based on the respect for the shared Old Testament. I know of no other people in modern times who had such profound respect for Jews. As we noted, this respect was the basis for Oliver Cromwell's arranging for Jews to be readmitted to England after an exile dating from the twelfth century. This amity made its way to the New World with the New England Puritans.

Law

It was this connection which enabled Jews to reach into positions of power in the young American nation. The initial entrée was through the legal profession and can be traced by following the careers of Louis Brandeis, Benjamin Cardozo, and Felix Frankfurter. Brandeis (1856–1941) was a graduate of Harvard Law School in 1877. He was well accepted by the Boston Brahmins, to the extent that soon after graduation he began a legal partnership with Samuel Warren, a Boston blue blood. He received further recognition when friends from Harvard recommended him to Massachusetts Supreme Court Chief Justice Horace Gray, who hired him as a clerk.¹ Harvard University offered him an assistant professorship in the Law School.

He was an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court from 1916 to 1939. This time period coincides with that of rapid industrialization and the concomitant labor-management issues. Following the onset of the Great Depression of 1929, it also coincided with the extension of government regulation to industry. The great questions of the industrialized West had to be answered. Should market forces prevail? Should the government nationalize the means of production and distribution? If there is to be a minimum wage, should there also be worker productivity requirements? Which branch of government should make these decisions: legislative, executive, or judicial? To what degree would industrialization change the nature of society? In discussing the roles of the three Jewish jurists, we will have to address the profound questions posed above.

Very soon after graduation Brandeis became interested in public causes and helped begin the pro bono publico tradition of public service. Looking at pro bono service over time, it is a question whether it has been more used to promote worthy causes or more misused to promote the leftist agenda. One practice Brandeis began was to bring to the Court pages of sociological data to support a legal claim: “Determined to support the constitutionality

of [an] Oregon law, Brandeis presented the case with only two pages of traditional appeals to legal doctrine and nearly a hundred pages summarizing statistical data from around the world.”² Thus began a new era for the Court in which it engaged itself (or allowed itself to be engaged) in studies from outside “experts.”

Brandeis was joined by Benjamin Cardozo in 1932. He was generally a dependable liberal vote on New Deal measures, but otherwise not distinguishable from the usual liberals of his era. He certainly could not be considered a radical. Following the appointment of Cardozo was that of Felix Frankfurter in 1939.

Frankfurter was an appointee, supporter, and friend of Franklin Roosevelt. In viewing the impact of Frankfurter on American history, I will look not at his decisions as a justice, but at his role as the provider of personnel to staff the New Deal agencies. The New Deal brought about a monumental shift in power from the periphery of the country, to Washington, DC., as FDR instituted the welfare state. There was no formal training ground for would-be bureaucrats, so finding personnel to staff the new agencies presented a problem. First, we must note that there were two types of agencies: the old ones such as the State Department, and the new alphabet soup agencies such as Works Progress Administration, Tennessee Valley Authority, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, National Labor Relations Board, National Recovery Administration, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, just to mention a few. The new agencies were important in redefining the nature of our government. With federal involvement in so many areas of daily life, Congress could not keep track of the growing list of regulations. So Congress authorized the agencies to draw up, on their own, the necessary regulations. This was to be under the overseeing eye of Congress. This loose oversight in reality left bureaucrats increasingly in control of daily life in America. Since the New Deal, the intrusion in our lives has inexorably increased.

Frankfurter was probably an atheist.³ The problem with some atheists is that, while not believing in God, they believe in the perfectibility of man. This leads them to attempt the impossible, with sometimes disastrous results, as seen in the former Soviet Union. Liva Baker describes Frankfurter quâ professor “as a high priest in the legal temple that was Harvard Law School.” It was his passion to unveil in all its manifestations the god of law to all its worshipers, then to send them like holy men out into the world to live in the memory of their vision and “try to build heaven on earth.”⁴ Years later, during his confirmation hearing in the Senate, Patrick McCarran asked Frankfurter whether he was a Marxist. Frankfurter answered:

Senator, I do not believe you have ever taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States with fewer reservations than I have or would now, nor do I believe you are more attached to the theories and practices of Americanism than I am. I rest my answer on that statement.⁵

I find this answer evasive. “It depends upon how you define is.” What is Frankfurter’s definition of Americanism? We may better answer this later.

He was fully aware of his own power in the legal profession:

Why do you think that being a judge is to sit at the right hand of God, and being a teacher of future judges and lawyers is something that doesn’t count...? The fabric of our law,

particularly our public law, we have been told repeatedly by the most farsighted in our profession, must be designed chiefly by the law schools.⁶

So far, it is clear that the universities are the ultimate source of knowledge and the law school is the brain of the university. For the modern university, law has taken the place formerly reserved for theology. Is it an improvement?

And if law is the chief vehicle for the betterment of mankind, what is the role of the Supreme Court? The Supreme Court, “the most undemocratic feature of American democracy,” is “in good truth...the Constitution.”⁷

Universities are the fount of all wisdom. The law schools chart our course. The faculties of social science, a little lower on the ladder, provide the technocrats to carry out the social engineering of the executive branch of the university, i.e., the court system. Now we have it: the Dictatorship of the Professoriate. One caveat: all universities were not created equal. Harvard is the ultimate pinnacle of not only social success, but the final arbiter of cultural norms. And, as a result of its philo-Semitic-Puritan tradition, Harvard was willing to accept Jews. Thus began the Anschluss. By remarkable coincidence, it catapulted the Jewish Left to the very nerve center of the body politic at the very time that the academy launched its takeover of nation.

Friends in High Places

Washington, DC, began to change with FDR and the New Deal: “from a placid, leisurely Southern town, with frozen faces and customs, into a gay, breezy sophisticated and metropolitan center.”⁸ By first placing a few men in key positions, Frankfurter created a funnel into New Deal agencies. Thomas G. Corcoran and Benjamin Cohen started out at the RFC. From there, they served to fill all sorts of New Deal agency slots. Of course, Frankfurter had direct access to FDR, just as Joseph had to Pharaoh.

Frankfurter’s staffing of New Deal agencies in quantity partly stemmed from the insatiable hunger for talent demanded by these offices, expanding under Roosevelt at enormous rates...partly, too, from Roosevelt’s confidence in Frankfurter’s dependability. But it was nothing new for Frankfurter. “He had been operating a one-man employment agency for Harvard Law School almost since he set foot in the place.”⁹ As we shall see in a subsequent chapter, Communists found these agencies to be ideal places from which to infiltrate government.

Although New Deal agencies were relatively easy to infiltrate, the old-line agencies, such as the State Department were more difficult. High positions at State tended to go to WASPs from old families, and there were relatively few such positions as compared to those available at the new agencies. But Jews and Communists (frequently the same) are nothing if not enterprising. As we shall see, where there is a will, there is a way. With access to governmental agencies, the Soviet Union had friends in high places. But ultimately more damaging by far, the non-Communist (but not necessarily non-communist Left) also had friends in high places. In the long run, the harm done to our country and culture by non-Communist members of the Left, particularly the Jewish Left, that has been immeasurably greater than that done by actual espionage.

Civil Rights Organizations

Among the descendents of the New England Puritans, there remains little if anything of the fear of God, let alone belief in God. What does remain is the spirit of aggressive righteousness as manifested by the abolitionists and the prohibitionists. It was also manifest in the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century foreign-mission movement that sent Protestants to China and India. No small number of today's Protestant Left (White Jews) are disillusioned descendents of these missionaries. Although the cause motivating these WASP enragés may change from time to time, the intensity of the effect is not lost. They are motivated now by perceived social ills rather than religious or moral questions. During the Vietnam War names like William Sloane Coffin and Benjamin Spock became household words.

NAACP

The initial support for founding the NAACP was from Northern Jews in the civil rights movement... These were the people, it is recalled, who were the earliest supporters of the fledgling NAACP. In 1914, Joel Spingarn, Professor Emeritus of Columbia University, became chairman of the NAACP and recruited for its board such Jewish leaders as Jacob Schiff, Jacob Billikopf, and Rabbi Stephen Wise. Jews were also the earliest supporters of the Urban League, founded in New York in 1911 to help newly arrived black migrants from the rural South.¹⁰

Jewish support is understandable and expected. There was also large support from the Protestant Left. A history of the NAACP by Mary White Ovington is found on the NAACP Web site. It lists about sixty cofounders of the NAACP. Almost every one of them who is not Jewish comes from the Protestant elite. Ovington herself was a student at Harvard (Radcliffe College) and a radical Socialist involved in every left-wing cause extant.¹¹

ACLU

Although the ACLU was to become a tool of the Jewish Left, some of its earliest members, like those of the NAACP, came from another source:

The ACLU leaders were overwhelmingly members of the American upper crust or, at least, the good middle class. The ACLU's national committee included Jane Addams; Charles F. Amidon and George W. Anderson, both of whom had resigned from the federal bench; Felix Frankfurter of the Harvard Law School; and William Z. Foster from the American Federation of Labor. Among the other board members were Scott Nearing, Norman Thomas, Crystal Eastman Fuller, Oswald Garrison Villard, Robert Morss Lovett of the University of Chicago, and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. New to the organization was its chairman, Dr. Harry F. Ward of the Union Theological Seminary in New York.¹²

In summary, I have noted here the coming together of the Jewish Left and the WASP enragés. I feel confident that I understand the psychology that motivates the Jewish Left. I have described phenomenologically the role of the WASP Left, but I do not feel I understand the psychological force(s) that motivate it.

1 American National Biography online sv "Brandeis".

2 Ibid., 141.

3 Liva Baker, Felix Frankfurter (New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1969), 18.

4 Ibid., 47.

5 Ibid., 209.

6 Ibid., 141.

7 Ibid., 185.

8 Ibid., 163.

9 Ibid., 164.

10 Howard M. Sachar, *A History of the Jews in America* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992), 803.

11 Unitarian Universalist Historical Society Web site, 2007. sv “Mary White Ovington.”

12 Robert C. Cottrell, *Roger Nash Baldwin and the American Civil Liberties Union* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), 122.

CHAPTER 32

THE PINK ORCHESTRA: JEWISH CONTROL OF THE MEDIA

For decades people have complained about Jewish control of the media. They are routinely dismissed as bigots. In fact, the complaint is justified because it is supported by reality. Media control is of supreme importance in American history because who controls the media controls the past. People’s perception of past (and passing) events is based on what they know of the event. In addition, the public’s attitude toward the event is conditioned by the context in which the event is reported. The news can be thus sculpted in a positive way. There is also a method of negative control by studied omission of facts that are inconsistent with the desired attitude the media wishes to create or sustain. In the extreme, such manipulation is propaganda, best exemplified by the Nazi and Soviet ministries of propaganda.

One of the inherent problems with presenting propaganda rather than news is that the more facts the journalist presents, the more difficult it becomes to function as propaganda. With the presentation of many facts, a perceptive reader will be able to piece out what journalist seeks to hide or obscure. In this sense, the New York Times is superior to a local city paper. Both are part of the mainstream media, and as such are purveyors of the left-wing agenda; however, as an unintended consequence of presenting more detail, the New York Times runs the risk of being less successful in its mission of shaping opinion. An unintended consequence.

The flagship of American media and the flagship of the Jewish-controlled media are one and the same: the New York Times. To trace the history of Jewish ownership of the NYT, we go back to the Revolution of 1848 in Bavaria. One of the refugees from that time and place was Julius Ochs (1826–1888). He settled first in Kentucky, then in Tennessee. He had a son, Adolph, (1858–1935) who entered into the newspaper business by starting a newspaper in Chattanooga in 1877, but the paper failed. He tried again by buying an existing paper, the Chattanooga Daily News. His editorial policy was to be “in line with the Conservative Democrats of the South.”¹ Both as a citizen and as a publisher, he was aware of his Jewishness and acted accordingly. “We should live quietly, happily, unostentatiously...Don’t be too smart. Don’t know too much.”²

In order to improve his financial status, and probably for reasons of prestige, Adolph decided to buy a paper in New York City. The New York Times was noted for its quality as a news source, but was failing as a business. Adolph bought it (1896) by highly leveraging the small capital he had and saved it from bankruptcy. By this time Adolph had married and had a daughter, Iphigene. With her enters the fatal seed of leftist ideology. In the meantime, Adolph was careful to cultivate the image of “reliability, comprehensiveness and objectivity.” As for his personal life as a Jew, he was fully assimilated, and not at all tolerant of the recent Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe:

Adolph himself had little tolerance for Jews who wore unclipped beards and long black frock coats, feeling it was unfair of them to set themselves “apart from other men, and then complain that [they are] treated differently from other men.”³

Adolph’s politics were conservative, and he faulted Louis Brandeis for his liberal views on labor and reformist attitude toward big business.⁴

Adolph’s views did not transfer to his daughter. She went to Barnard College of Columbia University, and there either her latent leftist tendencies came to light or she absorbed the radicalism of the place and time. She stated that her experience there “turned me into an early Socialist. I never quite got over my leftist leanings.”¹ The last phrase is an understatement.

As Iphigene was an only child, it was vitally important to Adolph that she married well, because in that era, only sons were supposed to manage businesses. In the event, she married Arthur Hayes Sulzberger (1891–1968). He went to Horace Mann School, “a private co-ed institution so progressive that the boys were taught to sew and the girls tended the garden on the school’s West 120th Street campus.”⁵ It is now clear that the descendants of this couple were to get a double dose of liberalism. But that is for the future. Having married the boss’s daughter, Arthur was appointed to run the news side of the paper. According to the policy of Adolph, the patriarch, the paper was to be “conservative and cautious and not involve itself in all public clamor for a change.”⁶ As Adolph’s health weakened, he relinquished day-to-day control of the paper to Arthur (and Iphigene, the one who owned the stock. —Arthur did not have voting shares). Now, contrary to Adolph’s opinion, the NYT began to back New Deal programs. This was due both to the liberal inclination of Arthur, but more importantly, to the prodding of his “Socialist” wife, Iphigene.⁷ In 1926, the couple presented Adolph with a grandson named Arthur Ochs Sulzberger (nicknamed “Punch”). At this point the two blood lines merged, and the issue of marrying the boss’s daughter was resolved by the “legitimacy” of the third generation. Punch had a weird childhood: “The Sulzbergers forbade Punch to play with toy soldiers or guns...Encouraged by his sisters’ example, Punch played with dolls.”⁸ Family life in the clan had gotten a little strange...It was to get even stranger.

A crisis occurred in 1935 because of the death of the patriarch, Adolph. At his demise, effective control of the paper could go one of two ways; to Arthur Hays Sulzberger, his son-in-law, or to Julius Ochs Adler, his nephew. The voting stock was owned by family members in a trust. There was some concern that if the son-in-law were put in control, he would be too liberal. That was not a risk with the conservative Julius. Probably due to the influence of Iphigene, the power went to Arthur Hays Sulzberger, her husband.⁹ The fatal die was cast.

In 1938, Arthur hired a man named Charles Merz as editor of the Editorial Page. This began a conscious policy, continuing to today, to showcase people who are not Jews in order to camouflage Jewish influence. Admittedly the screen is weak, but it is at least a fig leaf and shows some sensitivity on the part of the Jewish Left. Iphigene continued the idiot policy of having children educated in progressive schools: “Iphigene enrolled her oldest children, Marian and Ruth, in the Lincoln School, an experimental adjunct to Teachers College at Columbia. (It should be noted that the Lincoln school was heavily Jewish.¹⁰) The teaching methods were so unstructured that by the seventh grade Marian could barely read or write, and Ruth hadn’t the slightest notion of geography or the multiplication tables.”¹¹ These are the people who are responsible for the education page of the New York Times! Their own lives are out of control, and they seek to advise us! What arrogance! As for religious training, there was effectively none: “On Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur the children were kept out of school, but according to Judy, they didn’t know why. Even lox and bagels were unknown in the Sulzberger house.”¹² And the NYT has a page on religion!

Consistent with the guiding principle of the Jewish Left of anti-particularism, the NYT shamefully did its part as Holocaust deniers, but in a subtle way. One can bury a story or leave out salient details.

Because Arthur rejected the idea that Jews were members of a “race,” he was vehemently against collective phrases such as the Jewish people and launched a campaign to roust them from the Times. He instructed editors to substitute expressions like people of the Jewish faith or simply Jews, which he felt subtly conveyed the notion that being Jewish was something one could freely choose, like being Methodist or a Presbyterian.

Regarding the above, his daughter concluded the obvious: “Deep down, my father probably would just as soon not have been Jewish.”¹³ I don’t think one had to go very deep down to draw the conclusion that we have here a self-hating Jew. If there remains any doubt about Arthur’s attitude toward his own people, it should be dispelled by the two following quotes:

A July 2, 1944, dispatch citing “authoritative information” that 400,000 Hungarian Jews had already been deported to their deaths and an additional 350,000 were to be killed in the next three weeks received only four column inches on page twelve, while that same day a story about Fourth of July holiday crowds ran on the front page.¹⁴

The front page story on the liberation of Dachau never mentioned the word Jew. A week later Cy Sulzberger’s story about the Russian estimates of the death toll at Auschwitz appeared on page twelve, with no indication that most of the victims were Jews.¹⁵

The NYT has no credibility writing anything critical about Holocaust deniers, because they have set the pace in this matter. The above anecdote also shows how the NYT makes the news “fit” its private agenda. It can hardly claim to be the “paper of record” unless it be the record of intentional deception.

In matters of race, the NYT has a schizophrenic policy. In reporting crime, it would omit the racial identity of the culprit; simultaneously, it began, in 1945, a program to employ

Negroes as reporters. More than that, it began a policy, continuing today, to retain them even in the face of incompetence:

George Streater, a Fisk graduate with a master's degree from Western Reserve University, arrived at the NYT...Having worked only at activist publications; Streater had no training in the Times' tradition of objectivity. Turner discovered that sometimes Streater made up quotes in order to present blacks in a more positive light: "Once he admitted to me he'd invented some quotes for A. Philip Randolph, because he was sure he knew what Randolph meant to say, whether or not he said it." Corrections and critical memoranda piled up in Streater's file. The final straw was the omission of an important fact from a story about a black university in Texas, necessitating yet another "humiliating" correction in the NYT. Shortly thereafter, Catledge fired him.¹⁶

There is so much to comment about here. The NYT excludes mention of race in instances where the exclusion promotes their private political agenda. By the same token, they make a very public fetish of it for the same reason. There is no even-handedness here, and to keep up with what is currently politically correct is reminiscent of the same problem writers for the Soviet Union's state organs, Pravda and Izvestia, had to negotiate. In addition, the writers of my source for the history of the NYT (Tift and Jones) do not seem to find it remarkable that Streater, who had worked for the Crisis, the official journal of the NAACP, "had no training in NYT's tradition of objectivity"! What an admission on the part of the liberal apologists Tift and Jones that we should not expect objectivity from activist publications. It is an admission that the NAACP official journal, and others like it, are no more than propaganda mills. The point that they produce little but propaganda is no surprise, but for liberals to admit it—that is astounding. It is clearly a mistake on the part of Jones and Tift. This is an example of the problem of the lying publications I mentioned earlier: giving too many details makes the lie easier to discover. It is clear that the NYT is no better than the Crisis; it is merely more sophisticated.

The episode of false reporting by George Streater taught the Times nothing. The Times repeated the same scenario in the Jayson Blair case in 2003.

Time marched on, and so did the Times, lurching further to the left. The definitive turn to the left, the point at which the NYT lost any remaining claim to objectivity, was lost with the accession to power of Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, Jr. (nicknamed "Pinch"). He became assistant publisher in 1987; publisher in 1992, and chairman of the board of the NYT in 1997. He was and is an ideologue, and as such is a poor choice as publisher of a newspaper that claims objectivity as its chief asset. All citizens have the right to strong opinion, but the profession of journalism requires holding in abeyance such personal feelings. During the Vietnam War, he was arrested at least twice for blocking access to companies with government contracts. Pinch's hatred of America is startlingly clear in the following exchange: Arthur Sr. asked Pinch: "If a young American soldier comes upon a North Vietnamese soldier, which do you want to see get shot?" Pinch responded, "I would want to see the American get shot."¹⁷ As columnists he imported and supported shrill hacks, such as Molly Ivins, Bob Herbert, and Frank Rich. In coded fashion, he signaled the change from objective journalism to advocacy journalism: "Things don't have to 'happen' to be news. Shifts in the population and the relations between the races had a longer time horizon than the daily news cycle,"¹⁸ Two of his editors (Frankel and Lelyveld), like him, were advocates of "interpretive journalism."¹⁹ Probably one of the

clearest indications of the rejection of objective journalism was his comment critical of the NYT masthead motto “To give the news impartially, without fear or favor.” Instead, he opined “as you become more diverse, you’ve got to be clearer about what it is you are trying to say, because words mean different things to different people.”²⁰ Another way of spinning the segue to advocacy journalism was to state that the reporters had the responsibility “to add value by explaining and interpreting the news.”²¹

Although the NYT is the most important newspaper in the country, it is not the only one. Two other important papers are the Washington Post and the Los Angeles Times.

The Washington Post

In 1933, Eugene Meyer, a Jewish millionaire, bought the ailing Washington Post. He wanted a voice in the political arena. Early on he was aware of the power of journalism:

In those days few sensed that the real power of journalism was the power to define, the power to cover or not to cover. News was not yet viewed as subjective; all events were perceived as of predetermined importance.²²

He began as a liberal.²³ After the purchase of the paper, he was faced with the difficulty of finding people to run it. He had a daughter named Katherine, but he did not think her capable of running the paper. However, she solved the problem by marrying a very talented young man, Philip Graham. Philip Graham was put in charge. Mr. Meyer demonstrated his trust in Graham and also his residual old-fashioned values by putting majority stock in the young man’s name, rather than in his daughter’s name. The story of marrying the boss’s daughter, as in the case of “Punch” Sulzberger, is repeated here. Phil Graham and Katherine were both left of center, so there was no clash of opinion within the family.²⁴ Their choice of hires mirrored this: the political cartoonist Herbert Block and journalists Alan Barth and Jim Bellows. The ubiquitous Felix Frankfurter served as a source for some of these hires.²⁵ In 1964, the Jewish liberal Ed Guthman became national editor. Liberal bias was demonstrated in the Bay of Pigs invasion, during which the paper played down the event.²⁶ The Washington Post did not thoroughly investigate either the drowning of Mary Jo Kopechne at the hands of Teddy Kennedy at Chappaquiddick in 1969 or the death of Clinton legal counsel Vince Foster in 1993. Nor did it investigate the ease with which Ted Kennedy avoided any legal consequences subsequent to the Chappaquiddick incident. Compare these half-hearted efforts to the investigative energy the Washington Post invested in the Watergate scandal. At the very onset of his career, Phil Graham had enunciated the need to shape the news: “He was the friend of the powerful, advisor to them, doer, activist; his instructions to the city editor, Ben Gilbert, left no doubt that the paper was to be an instrument for social progress. Stories that reflected badly on integration or home rule simply would not make the paper.”²⁷

Other Print Media

The slide of the Los Angeles Times into liberalism was incremental. It was, until the sixties, a conservative Republican paper, free of Jewish ownership and editorship. It became liberal largely in the course of events, by hiring writers who were the products of the new journalism schools, that is, “professionals.” During the midsixties, The L.A. Times hired three high-powered investigative journalists. Ed Guthman became national

editor. He was a typical Jewish liberal: “Guthman was highly respected in the profession, and even though he had flacked for Robert Kennedy, he had never been perceived as a flack, but rather as a man of strong social conscience whose roots were in investigative reporting. He believed it was a reporter’s responsibility to be involved in issues, not to stand on the sidelines; to push forward and uncover scandal.”²⁸ Don Bruckner was cut from the same cloth: “an extraordinarily talented and cerebral reporter, covered civil rights with great sensitivity and feeling for detail.”²⁹ The third, Jim Bellows, was at least equally leftist, but was not Jewish. The L.A. Times has been generally less extreme than the NYT.

Of all the weekly news magazines, probably Time has been, and still probably is, the most influential. It was founded in the 1920s by Henry Luce, an internationalist with strong personal ties to China. Unlike the Marxists, who felt that history was driven by anonymous forces, Luce believed that “men, not the great rhythms of history or economics, were the key to the past.”³⁰ He was no cultural relativist; he was convinced that Western values were best, and he influenced the news accordingly.³¹ The change at Time occurred after the death of Henry Luce.

In May, 1968, Henry Grunwald, the foreign editor, was promoted to managing editor. This was a conscious effort to change the politics of the magazine from Right to center. In the event, it turned out to be the beginning of the decline of Time to its present status as a run-of-the-mill left-wing hack copy machine. Henry Grunwald was an Austrian-Jewish refugee from Hitler. He was very at home in the New York intellectual world.³² He was a nonobservant Jew.³³ He was the right man at the right place “to turn” a major media outlet.

There are many more print media outlets owned or controlled by the Jewish Left. Time and space constraints limit the exploration here.

Hollywood

Children are born with potentials; they are not born with values and attitudes. These latter are acquired by exposure to other humans. In addition, there is the impact of myth on the value system of the developing child. I use the term myth in its broadest sense. Ancient cultures had myths to explain creation, family, and tribe. It was also from myth that right and wrong were determined. In the broadest sense, myth would include religion. The translation of myth to tradition produced culture. Frequently religion and myth were so intertwined that they could not be separated. In preliterate cultures, myths were oral. Eventually they were written. From birth to burial, the individual was steeped in myth and its realization, culture.

Formal myths are written and discussed. Informal myths may be subliminal, but still dictate cultural norms. Anyone interested in comprehensive knowledge of this field may consult the canons of religion, physical anthropology, and ethics. Any meaningful review of this field is beyond the scope of this book.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, a little-noted revolution began. Moving pictures came into existence due to technical advances, primarily electricity. As a result, people everywhere could expose themselves to amusement cheaply. Before this time, the closest equivalent, theater, from street theater to grand opera, was limited by expense. By

the early twentieth century, a nickel or dime could be the ticket to escapism every day. The earliest purveyors of this new media, as well as their critics, were aware of its power. It would be a mistake to underestimate the power of this new media and its electronic successors, such as radio and television. It is frequently the most important single influence on shaping the values of a child in the U.S. Only a very strong family structure is proof against the media.

But Meyer realized, as so many moral arbiters did, that the movies transmitted values, and that by controlling entertainment, he would be inculcating values, which in turn, would make him a kind of father to the whole community—its moral and spiritual guide.³⁴

He was not alone in this realization. Henry Ford, in his anti-Semitic paper, *The Dearborn Independent*, also noted it:

[The media is] Jew-controlled, not in spots only, not fifty percent merely, but entirely; with the natural consequence that now the world is in arms against the trivializing and demoralizing influence of that form of entertainment as presently managed...As soon as the Jews gained control of the “movies,” we had a movie problem, the consequences of which are not yet visible. It is the genius of that race to create problems of a moral character in whatever business they achieve a majority.³⁵

Henry Ford’s assessment of the degree of control is exaggerated, but it is true that the preponderant influence was Jewish. There were also Jews who noticed this influence with regret. In 1931, the following open letter was run in the *Christian Century*:

I am a Jew, but I am ashamed of my kinship with people who have wholly forgotten their spiritual mission and are now engaged only in the feverish acquisition of wealth by pandering to the worst instincts of humanity.³⁶

In reading these quotes, I am not sure that I understand the issues of 1931. But given the role of Hollywood Jews in the late-twentieth century, these critiques could not be better stated.

In the first generation of Jewish moguls, there was a refreshing patriotism. Take the case of Louis B. Meyer, a Russian refugee. He did not know his actual birth date. So he adopted the Fourth of July. He became a rabid, conservative Republican.³⁷ He went so far as to as to lecture Mickey Rooney, apparently for womanizing:

We looked out the window because there was screaming going on, and Louis B. Meyer held Mickey Rooney by the lapel. He says, “You’re Andy Hardy! You’re the United States! You’re the Stars and Stripes. Behave yourself! You’re a symbol!”³⁸

Adolph Zukor, founder of Paramount Pictures, was equally patriotic. He too, became a conservative Republican.³⁹ He was also rigidly monogamous. He wanted to present films that would elevate the common culture. To that end he produced, in rapid succession, *Queen Elizabeth*, *The Count of Monte Cristo*, *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*, and *The Prisoner of Zenda*.

But a transition was on the way. The studio bosses needed screen writers. They got them from New York, because New York had a pool of underemployed Jewish intellectuals:

The Jews in New York were socialists. They were old-country socialists...and unions and left-wing thinking of that simple soul that was so Jewish in those days was translated to their children...young Jews with a gift for writing wanted to use it to right wrongs, expose injustices, redress grievances, and create new worlds, and that is precisely what they tried to do...Alvah Bessie, screenwriter and one-time drama critic for the left-wing New Masses, admitted surprise when Warner Brothers' executive Jerry Wald told him they deliberately hired progressives "because these boys knew what society in general and fascism in particular were all about...and could create characters and situations that bore some resemblance to reality."40

Today, these young Jews are no longer there, but their grandchildren are and are producing the same propaganda quâ entertainment.

Now we can turn our attention to the successors of the original moguls. When we do so, we find names such as Michael Eisner, Jeffrey Katzenberg, David Geffen, and Steven Spielberg. For them patriotism is a dirty word. They do not seek to honor America, but to remake it in the mold set for them by Karl Marx. They support every corrosive scheme of the Jewish Left. They support gay marriage, racial preferences for Negroes, and centralization of power in Washington, DC. They have become enemies of liberty and are instead exponents of Judeofascism.

This change appears to be generic in the Jewish community—the same transition can be seen at the NYT from the conservative patriarch who created an objective "paper of record" to the current hippy-freak who has reduced it to a shrill, partisan rag. This transition is more than disappointing, it is dangerous to a free society.

The Jewish influence in radio and television is no less. However, constraints of time will require me to defer the study of these industries to another time.

1 E. Tifft and Alex S. Jones, *The Trust* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1999), 16.

2 *Ibid.*, 25.

3 *Ibid.*, 93

4 *Ibid.*, 97.

5 *Ibid.*, 110.

6 *Ibid.*, 157.

7 *Ibid.*, 157.

8 *Ibid.*, 139.

9 *Ibid.*, 167.

10 *Ibid.*, 187.

11 *Ibid.*, 186.

12 *Ibid.*, 187.

13 *Ibid.*, 215.

14 *Ibid.*, 217.

- 15 Ibid., 237.
- 16 Ibid., 276–277.
- 17 Ibid., 499.
- 18 Ibid., 617.
- 19 Ibid., 620.
- 20 Ibid., 647.
- 21 Ibid., 656.
- 22 David Halberstam, *The Powers That Be* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979), 182.
- 23 Ibid., 175.
- 24 Ibid., 170–171.
- 25 Ibid., 169.
- 26 Ibid., 374.
- 27 Ibid., 188.
- 28 Ibid., 399.
- 29 Ibid., 400.
- 30 Ibid., 46.
- 31 Ibid., 47.
- 32 Ibid., 549–550.
- 33 www.washingtonpost.com (obituary, Feb. 27, 2005).
- 34 Neil Gabler, *An Empire of Their Own* (New York: Doubleday, 1988), 86.
- 35 Ibid., 277.
- 36 Ibid., 278.
- 37 Ibid., 115.
- 38 Ibid., 216.
- 39 Ibid., 25.
- 40 Ibid., 323.

CHAPTER 33

THE SPEAR: JEWS AND BLACKS

The Problem

Slavery was viable in the southern colonies of British North America because of the plantation system. Demand for tobacco, rice, and cotton both in the colonies and abroad drove the system, and the pre-mechanization status of agricultural techniques supplied the pressure for slave labor. The slaves imported from West Africa came from many African cultures, and thus as a group, lacked a common culture. They had no common language,

common religion, nor related tribal structure. They had no holy books. Whatever religious practices they might have had individually could have had nothing in common with that of their Christian masters. They could have had no defined and commonly recognized classes among themselves.

This loss of an entire culture for a vast number of people may be unprecedented in human history. What holds a people together is a shared culture. When the Jews were slaves in Egypt, they retained folklore, a language, and a religion. They knew who they had been. During the Babylonian Exile, the same was true, only by that time, the cultural heritage was even richer. In addition, in most historic instances of slavery, the enslaved population was drawn from peoples of relatively similar cultures, so both slave and owner had some common ground. Enslaved populations may have had languages different from the dominant population, but the children of the slaves would speak the common language and would usually be physically indistinguishable from non-slaves.

The situation of the African slaves bears comparison with that of the Indians (i.e., Mayan, Aztec) of South America who were enslaved by the Spanish. The enslaved Indian populations were able to retain their native languages. They knew that they came from an ancient culture, and they preserved myths from ancient times. In many cases the land bore archeological witness to their past greatness, and they lived on the land in which their ancestors were buried. They were able to infuse in the Catholic religion many elements of their native religions. Their individual family structures suffered far less disruption.

Maybe a thought experiment would be the best way to appreciate the trauma of the African slave experience: imagine that you were abducted by aliens and taken to another planet and put at forced labor, with no explanation of where you were. You are surrounded by people who look very different, whose language is incomprehensible, and whose behavior is unpredictable. The land has vegetation and animals you have never seen before. You have no overall grasp of your situation, nor for how long it would last.

The United States Constitution is best viewed within the context of the Enlightenment in its broadest context. The concept of the Rights of Man was gaining strength throughout Western and Central Europe, even in the lands of the “benevolent despots.” The tension between the promise of the U.S. Constitution and the reality of slavery was unbearable and was resolved during our Civil War. That this was a “sign of the times” is demonstrated by the outlawing of serfdom in France at the time of their Revolution (1789), and, the abolition of serfdom in Prussia and Russia in the mid-nineteenth century.

The abolition of serfdom in Europe was effective because the son of a serf could potentially rise far above his father’s station through education or enterprise. In North America, the situation was different. The freed African slaves were racially distinct from the majority population. Thus it was much harder to lose identity as a separate class of people. The son of a slave still had a black skin.

Now, imagine another group, small in number, but advantaged in every way that the American Negro is disadvantaged. This small group, cunning and united, seeks to obtain an ally whose population would give the small group the numerical clout it lacks. The Negro has no preexisting culture, has a gutted family structure, is desperately poor, and has no allies. The perfect mark. The Jewish Left, few in number (the head of the spear)

have found a useful tool. The Negro is to provide the shaft for the spearhead. The raw material for the weapon against liberty is at hand; it has yet to be shaped. This thread of the story will be continued as the history of the NAACP.

Solutions

It is obviously impossible to outline the problem of slavery and race in the United States in one chapter of one book. Thus I have to limit the discussion to what is essential to support my premises. There were in general two major approaches to a solution on the part of the Negro community. The earlier was that of Booker T. Washington, which emphasized self-help. He favored technical training over theoretical, at least for the masses. His attitude toward racism was to slowly dissolve it by Negro self-sufficiency and economic advancement based on Negro achievement within the existing culture. The alternative approach was that of W. E. B. Du Bois, who favored higher level education (law and medicine) in order to produce and sustain a cultural Negro elite (the "Talented Tenth"), which would serve a leadership role in the Negro community. In addition, he preferred a more confrontative approach to racial injustice. The differences between the two men were not absolute; these differences were more a matter of degree than kind.

Niagara Movement

In July, 1905, a small group of Negro leaders met in Niagara, Ontario (Canada) to form an organization called the Niagara Movement. There were no whites or Jews among them. It was a purely Negro affair. Their statement of purpose asked that they be accorded the rights common to all other Americans. The statement closed by including a list of responsibilities the Negro accepted as American citizens:

Duties: And while we are demanding, and ought to demand, and will continue to demand the rights enumerated above, God forbid that we should ever forget to urge corresponding duties upon our people:

The duty to vote.

The duty to respect the rights of others.

The duty to work.

The duty to obey the laws.

The duty to be clean and orderly.

The duty to send our children to school.

The duty to respect ourselves, even as we respect others.

This statement, complaint and prayer we submit to the American people, and Almighty God.¹

No well-meaning American can find fault with this statement.

NAACP

The Niagara Movement lasted only a few years. Due to lack of financial resources, it folded. However, its rise and demise were noted by powerful forces: the Jewish Left and the Protestant Left. They noted the moral power inherent in the cause. The cause itself was as compelling as had been abolition as a cause. Causes are necessary to promote

social agendas that transcend the cause. Specific causes are secondary to the overarching goal. Those who believe in the cause are useful, as their energy may be put at the disposal of the wise men and women who understand the larger issues. The Niagara Movement, as it had been constituted, had attributes considered fatal to those wise great powers. First, the movement was controlled by Negroes, and as such could not be manipulated at will to serve a greater cause. Secondly, it included a list of responsibilities incumbent upon Negroes, and as such was counterproductive to those greater forces whose ultimate goal was (and is) to dissolve the entire existing social order. The Niagara Movement had to die.

But the power of the cause quâ cause had to be preserved and cultivated. So the NAACP was founded by the Protestant and Jewish Left, with almost no Negro membership. Of the six founding members, only two were Negro. One of the two was W. E. B. Du Bois. Regarding transfer of Niagara Movement membership to the NAACP, Du Bois notes: “In the end, Trotter, the most radical Negro leader, and Mrs. Ida Wells Barnett...refused to join the new organization, being distrustful of white leadership.”²

Du Bois however, understood and agreed with the greater purpose of the new organization:

Back of this lay an unasked question as to the relation of the American Negro group itself to the whole labor movement. This was not raised but several of the group were socialists, including myself...the history of our day...may be epitomized in one word— Empire; the domination of white Europe over black Africa and yellow Asia, through political power built on the economic control of labor, income, and ideas. The echo of this industrial imperialism in America was the expulsion of black men from American democracy, their subjection to caste control and wage slavery.³

It was not for nothing that Du Bois had been educated at Harvard and in Germany. He was the sort of Negro who could be used; his internal motive forces were self-sufficient drivers. Like a well-trained horse, he could serve his purpose without oversight. A history of the founding of the NAACP is given by Mary White Ovington, herself a Socialist and founder. She gives a list of about fifty cofounders. It reads as a Who’s Who of the Jewish Left and the Protestant Left. One of original six founders, Mr. William Walling is a classic case of white liberal guilt. He came from a slave-owning family. Ovington writes of him: “Mr. Walling had spent some years in Russia where his wife, working for the cause of the revolutionaries, had suffered imprisonment.”⁴ When assessing the threat to liberty posed by the Jewish Left and the Protestant Left, one is hard-pressed to state from which quarter the threat is greater.

Although it has not been previously stressed, we should note that the Niagara Movement was founded by men and women who had a deep respect for religion. The NAACP was founded by atheists. Over the years the chief complaint the Communist Party (and other left-wing organizations) have had regarding Blacks is their “religiosity.” It is presumed that this trait can be purged.

At this point we must make reference to an earlier chapter. In chapter 8, I noted the role played by clientela in the Roman Republic. This was a practice in which wealthy or socially dominant elements obtained the support of numbers by organizing poor masses to do their bidding. In return, the wealthy few arranged to obtain limited benefits for the

masses. The same dynamic is at work here. In this instance, to ensure that the masses do what they are supposed to do, and to avoid independent thought or action on the part of the Negroes, the leadership was predominantly Jewish. Most of the money was (and probably still is) supplied by Jews.

By the last quarter of the twentieth century, enough Negroes had been “in the traces” of the Jewish Left that their political instincts had been co-opted. Review the leadership of the NAACP from its inception to present. Most of the administrators have been members of the Jewish Left. As the twentieth century drew toward its close, the Negro family structure had been so weakened that the vacuum left by the evaporation of any sense of right and wrong could be filled with a free-floating sense of anger and frustration on the part of young Negroes. This anger has been, and is being, channeled by the Jewish Left into a powerful tool. By the late-twentieth century, the mentality of the Black leadership had been so perverted by the Jewish Left that the takeover of the leadership of the NAACP by Blacks themselves posed no threat of policy revision. The Black vote is 90-plus percent consistent with the wishes of the Master.

A new form of slavery had been established, all the more destructive as a result of the insidious evolution of the internalization of the slave mentality. In addition, a native leadership had been cultivated that would consciously or unconsciously promote the Marxist agenda.

The Uses of the American Negro

How did it get that way? For the Jewish Left, the Negro is indispensable as a tool against established society, a free market, and ultimately, liberty. There are so many examples of this use of Blacks as instruments, that I will have to limit consideration to the most illustrative. The instance of the Welfare Rights Organization by Columbia University professors is fitting. A husband-wife team, Richard Cloward and Francis Fox Piven, came up with a novel idea, fiendishly destructive. Making use of a radicalized middle-class Black man named G. A. Wiley, they implemented the strategy outlined below:

George Alvin Wiley is best known for his effective use of the so-called “Cloward-Piven strategy,” which called for swamping the welfare rolls with new applicants, beyond which the system could bear. The plan’s inventors, Columbia University political scientists Richard Cloward and Francis Fox Piven, hoped that the resulting economic collapse would lead to political turmoil and ultimately socialism. Cloward and Piven recruited Wiley to put their plan to work in the streets.⁵

Because Cloward and Piven so clearly illustrate the “Anschluss” of Jewish Left and Protestant elite, I will digress momentarily to remark upon this couple. Richard Cloward was the son of a radical Baptist minister and a radical feminist mother.⁶ Francis Fox Piven, (née Fox), was the daughter of Jewish-Russian immigrants to this country, a country she did so much to injure.⁷ Here is a typical case of “savage ingratitude.” Unfortunately, such examples are all too common.

But the instance of the partnership of this couple also serves to symbolize something. It demonstrates (literally and figuratively) the marriage of the Jewish Left to the Protestant Elite. It is all too easy, and intellectually lazy, to blame only the Jewish half of this malevolent partnership. It is crucial not to overlook the conjunction of the two forces.

The presence of the Jewish Left has been necessary to work toward the destruction of American liberty, but not sufficient. The Protestant Elite must be present as a co-factor.

My digression complete, we return to the main topic of how these two forces, identified above, made use of the American Negro. Their strategy worked, at least in part, due to WASP guilt:

Wiley and his welfare radicals terrorized social workers all over the United States, but their greatest success came in New York City. Newly elected in 1966, Mayor John Lindsey knuckled under to every demand from NWRO. New York's welfare rolls had already been growing by 12 percent per year before Lindsey took office. The growth rate jumped to 50 percent annually in 1966. "By the early 1970's, one person was on the welfare rolls in New York City for every two working in the city's private economy," writes Sol Stern in Manhattan Institute's City Journal. As a direct result of its reckless welfare spending, New York City was forced to declare bankruptcy in 1975.⁸

Again, how do we decide whether the Jewish Left or the Protestant Elite Left is more destructive?

The misery to the Black community is immeasurable, but the Left is indifferent. The Left is interested in the expansion of the clientela base. How many more dependents have been created by the Cloward-Piven strategy?

The situation gets even worse. By means of a sleight of hand that would make Satan himself jealous, the conjoint forces of the Jewish and Protestant Left use the misery they have spawned to multiply the evil. They have created a machine to mass-produce poverty. We have seen that. Now, with devilish ingenuity, they blame the average American for the poverty, and demand more taxes to repair the poverty. And how to repair it? By adding more machinery to the production line that creates poverty, that is, more government programs, and the requisite taxation to fund the new poverty-producing machinery necessitated by the resulting increased poverty levels. The common term for this is "vicious cycle," but I would call it a "social terrorism."

What is the impact of these programs? Can they be quantified? Yes, to some extent. Let's consider unemployment figures for teenagers:

The labor force participation rates and unemployment rates of black and white teenagers were virtually identical until 1955. Since that time, however, unemployment rates for black teenagers have risen relative to other groups while labor-force participation rates fell. By 1988, 35% of black teenagers (16–19 years of age) were unemployed as compared to 13% of white teenagers."⁹

Much of the evil generated is more difficult to quantify. The cultural decay in the Black community that leads to an endemic hatred for education and traditional achievement is most damaging. Teenage boys walking around with their pants down to their knees; the widespread acceptance of women with multiple children from different fathers; the elevation of poor language skills and illiteracy to cult status; the rap music that pollutes the mind; the ubiquity of violence; the dominance of the drug culture as a model for young men; and the acceptance of a life on welfare as the norm... All of these are evidence of the decay.

Jacob and Esau: The Bowl of Porridge

And Jacob gave Esau bread and lentil stew, and he went to eating and drinking. Then he got up and went his way. So Esau despised his birthright. (Genesis 24:34)

For a pittance, for welfare payments.

For a pittance, for rap music.

For a pittance, a snort of crack cocaine.

Is that all the Jewish Left had to pay to buy the Black vote? A mitziah (Yiddish for a real bargain)!

The Real Victims

An allegory:

In Book VII of the Republic, Plato has Socrates spell out an allegory.

“A population of people is chained in a cave so that they face away from the sun and only see shadows of what passes on earth. And since they had never seen reality, when they speak to each other, they would discuss the shadows as if the shadows were reality. But suppose one of their number is released and freed to wonder upon the earth. He then goes back to visit the others, still chained as before.

“And when he remembered his old habitation, and the wisdom of the den and his fellow-prisoners, do you not suppose that he would felicitate himself on the change, and pity them [the others still chained]?”

“Certainly, he would.

“And if they were in the habit of conferring honors among themselves on those who were the quickest to observe the passing shadows and to remark which of them went before, and which followed after, and which were together, and who were therefore best able to draw conclusions as to the future, do you think that he would care for such honors and glories, or envy the possessors of them? Would he not say with Homer, ‘Better to be the poor servant of a poor master, and to endure anything rather than think as they do and live after their manner?’ ”

“Yes,” he said, “I think that he would rather suffer anything than entertain these false notions and live in this miserable manner.”

“Imagine once more,” I said, “such a one coming suddenly out of the sun to be put back in his old situation; would he not be certain to have his eyes full of darkness?”

“To be sure,” he said.

“And if there were a contest, and he had to compete in measuring the shadows with the prisoners who had never moved out of the den... would he not be ridiculous? Men would say of him that he went up, he came back down with his eyes corrupted, and that it was better not even to think of ascending, and if any one tried to loose another and lead him up to the light, let them only catch the offender, and they would put him to death.”

I put in this allegory in order to do honor to the real heroes of Black America. They are the conservatives such as Walter Williams, Thomas Sowell, and Clarence Thomas. Because they see clearly the shell game of the Jewish Left, they have been vilified in the Jewish-controlled mainstream media. Thus the Protestant Left and the Jewish Left, which

together form the bulk of the “chattering class,” or the Pink Orchestra, or the mainstream media (all terms for the same thing), portray them as traitors to their race, when exactly the reverse is true. Thus these Black men mentioned above are human beings of extraordinary courage. They speak the truth despite being vilified by the white media and being vilified by the rank and file of the Black masses, effectively lobotomized by the Jewish Left.

1 Gilder.Lehrman.Center@yale.edu

2 W.E.B. Du Bois, *The Autobiography of W.E. Burghardt Du Bois* (New York: International Publishers, 1968), pg. 254.

3 Ibid, 254-255.

4 www.naacp.org/about/history/howbegan/

5 www.discoverthenetworks.org/sv. “George Alvin Wiley”. retrieved 2/7/08.

6 Obituary of Richard Cloward, *New York Times*, August 23, 2000. nytimes.com.

7 “The Guardian Profile,” Nov. 4, 2000. from [Guardian Unlimited@Guardian News and Media Limited](mailto:GuardianUnlimited@GuardianNewsandMediaLimited), 2007.

8 Obituary of Richard Cloward. (See above).

9 Paul A. Samuelson and William D. Nordhaus, *Economics*, 13th edition (New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1989), 295.

CHAPTER 34

IT COULDN'T BE CLEARER: HERBERT MARCUSE

In chapter 30, we met Herbert Marcuse, as one of the Frankfurt School who had escaped from Hitler's Germany. Like the others of his group, he was a Jewish Communist/Marxist. As we noted, he fought as a Communist in Germany in 1919 against the Weimar government, the government that succeeded the monarchy of Wilhelm II. Migration to the United States gave him a reprieve from being reduced to his intrinsic worth as a bar of soap. He expressed savage ingratitude by trying to destroy his host country. Far better men than he were not so fortunate as to escape. Fate is certainly not a discriminating mistress.

In 1968, as a senior Judeofascist, he gave a talk to Brandeis undergraduates, a band of neophyte Judeofascists. He entitled his talk “Repressive Tolerance.” In this talk, he made clear his views of freedom of expression; there is none. Because we are in a “crisis,” he informs us, we cannot tolerate freedom of expression:

The whole post-fascist period is one of clear and present danger. Consequently, true pacification requires the withdrawal of tolerance before the deed, at the stage of communication in word, print, and picture. Such extreme suspension of the right of free speech and free assembly is indeed justified only if the whole of society is in extreme danger. I maintain that our society is in such an emergency situation, and that it has become the normal state of affairs. Different opinions and “philosophies” can no longer compete peacefully for adherence and persuasion on rational grounds.¹

But society cannot be indiscriminate...where freedom and happiness themselves are at stake: here certain things cannot be said, certain ideas cannot be expressed, certain policies cannot be proposed, certain behavior cannot be permitted without making tolerance an instrument for the continuation of servitude.²

At that time, the crisis was social inequity. We have had crises in health care, homelessness, and currently, global warming. The Left will never be at a loss for a crisis. They will use any given (or contrived) crisis as a reason to transfer power to the central government.

Now we discuss discussion. Some ideas are acceptable to the Judeofascists; others are not:

Moreover, in endlessly dragging debates over the media, the stupid opinion is treated with the same respect as the intelligent one, the misinformed may talk as long as the informed, and propaganda rides along with education, truth, and falsehood. This pure toleration of sense and nonsense is justified by the democratic argument that nobody, neither group nor individual, is in possession of the truth and capable of defining what is right and wrong, good and bad.

The quote continues, as it tells us that the people are not competent to decide what should and should not be tolerated:

Therefore, all contesting opinions must be submitted to “the people” for its deliberation and choice. But I have already suggested that the democratic argument implies a necessary condition, namely that the people must be capable of deliberating and choosing.³

In the body of this talk, he makes it quite clear that the people lack this ability. Who, then, should choose for them? Why, Dr. Marcuse, of course!

Is there any alternative other than the dictatorship of an “élite” over the people? For the opinion of the people (usually designated People) who are unfree in the very faculties in which liberalism saw the roots of freedom: independent thought and independent speech can carry no overriding validity and authority—even if the People constitute the overwhelming majority.⁴

Lest we Americans underestimate the degree to which Marcuse will accept mass murder to achieve his ends, let us do two things. First, let us recall the mass murders carried out in Russia, Poland, and Hungary by the Left, and that many of the commissars were drawn from the Jewish Left that had remained in Europe. Remember: the only difference between the Jewish Left in Europe and the U.S. is geographical. Given the opportunity, they will do here what they have already done there. Secondly, let us read his own words:

In terms of historical function, there is a difference between revolutionary and reactionary violence, between violence practiced by the oppressed and by the oppressors. In terms of ethics, both forms of violence are inhuman and evil—but since when is history made in accordance with ethical standards? To start applying them at the point where the oppressed rebel against the oppressors, the have-nots against the haves is serving the cause of actual violence by weakening the protest against it.⁵

Two things are happening here. First, Marcuse is excusing the slaughters done by Communist demagogues, slaughters in which members of the Jewish Left participated as butchers. Secondly, he is alerting us that he is willing to do the same here.

It is clear that what may and what may not be said and done will be dictated by Marcuse and those like him. The Jewish Left is supremely arrogant. The essay from which I just quoted can be found online. It is about twenty pages in length. I highly recommend my readers familiarize themselves with it. It is perhaps the clearest and most honest exposition of what the Jewish Left has in mind for us in the United States. What is chilling is that we are partway there. The political correctness movement (which is a euphemism for Communism) has already obtained hegemony on our campuses. I wish I could say that it had only gained a foothold, but it is too late for that. In fact, the movement has permeated the entire cultural establishment. It is a top-down movement, consistent with the elitism of the Jewish Left and its allied forces.

This perversion of meaning has progressed so far and its intrusion into our daily lives is so ubiquitous, as to be hardly noticeable. The replacement of words such as “waitress” with “waitperson” or “chairman” with “chairperson” are but two examples. Marcuse gave us warning in 1968 that this was the direction the Jewish Left was going to take:

Withdrawal of tolerance from regressive movements before they can become active; intolerance even toward thought, opinion and word...[It] must begin at the place of entrance, there where the false consciousness takes form (or rather: is systematically formed)—it must begin with stopping the words and images which feed this consciousness. To be sure, this is censorship, even precensorship.⁶

Clearly, he had very good students. They are diligently continuing the work of the master.

“Economic Justice” as a Prerequisite for Utopia

There is an ideological underpinning to the PC movement that is a given, but for the sake of completeness, I will restate it. The presumption is that no just society can be said to exist in the absence of “economic justice,” that is, Communism. Under this economic system, the goods and services generated by those who produce are taken by force and redistributed at the pleasure of the elite. Inevitably, in a short period of time, the pool of goods and services evaporates, and the masses of the people have much less than before, but the elite still gets its cut from the top.

Utopia, or is it Hell?

With the inevitable collapse of the economy in any Communist state, there is the inevitable arrival of the gangster state. I say inevitable, because whoever has the power to redistribute goods and services controls the state. Under Communism, bureaucrats dictate production and distribution. These same bureaucrats have the power to define what is and is not permitted to be said or written. The original Ten Amendments to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, may become a subversive document, no longer readily available to the public. History will be rewritten so that its former existence will be blotted out from public memory. The old Soviet Union had historians whose full-time job was to rewrite history. I am sure the Jewish Left was well represented in the Soviet academic establishment; they certainly are well represented in that of the contemporary United

States. Their dean is Howard Zinn. Similar, although less-known Judeofascists currently are active on every major university faculty in the U.S.

Giving Credit Where Credit Is Due

All the above being said, it would be a mistake to think that the Jewish Left either did or could have accomplished what was done either in Europe or in the United States without allies. We have encountered the two principal allies of the Jewish Left in the U.S.: the WASP elite as equals and the American Negro as a client population. The enemy has suborned brains and purchased brawn.

1 Robert P. Wolff, Barrington Moore, Herbert Marcuse, *A Critique of Pure Tolerance* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), 110.

2 *Ibid.*, 88.

3 *Ibid.*, 94.

4 *Ibid.*, 120–121.

5 *Ibid.*, 103.

6 *Ibid.*, 110–111.

CHAPTER 35

THE SHARK AND THE PIRANHAS

The Shark: The ACLU

Discussion of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) would be easier if it were all “good” or all “bad.” It is neither. It has 500,000 members, many of whom disagree with each other. Also, it is not a single issue organization. Still, it is my opinion that it is, overwhelmingly, a sinister force in the USA.

It was begun in 1920 as the successor organization to a group called the Civil Liberties Bureau. The CLB was organized to defend people critical of U.S. involvement in WW I, including the rights of conscientious objectors. The founders of the ACLU were Crystal Eastman (1881–1928) and Roger Nash Baldwin (1884–1981). They wanted to continue the work of the organization, and to increase the scope to include issues beyond those raised by the First World War. The causes at issue would be “freedoms endangered by government repression, especially against labor-free speech, a free press, and the right to strike, criminal justice, immigration equity, and racial equality.”¹

Crystal Eastman came from the already familiar background of the WASP elite, that elite which makes common cause with the Jewish Left. She graduated from Smith College, a nursery for such as she. Having no real purpose in life, and blessed with affluent circumstances, she succumbed to the infantile Leftism that was as prevalent as the influenza epidemic of 1919.² The difference is that the influenza killed its victims and that the victims of Leftism survived, becoming a continuing source of contamination to society at large. When their Puritan forbearers warned them that “the devil makes work for idle hands,” they knew of what they spoke.

She was joined in this noble endeavor by her male counterpart, Roger Nash Baldwin, similarly bored with whatever the idle rich of that period did for amusement. It would

have been much better for the world, and certainly for the United States, if the ruling doyens and doyennes of upper-crust culture had been more creative. Boredom among the wealthy is dangerous for the rest of us. Baldwin came from old wealth. “The lines on both sides of the family went back to the Pilgrims. Baldwin attended Wellesley public schools. As a boy he lacked prowess in sports and developed interests in music, art, and nature. He was regarded as “different,” which made him seek, early in life, “unconventional, nonconformist avenues of expression” consistent with the intellectual heritage of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, and other New England icons. His family were free-thinking Unitarians.³

Baldwin carried two serious risk factors. First, he was of the idle rich. Secondly, he was weird. Weirdos are dangerous because they project the cause of their unhappiness outside of themselves. If they are very weird, they become mental cases and ineffective. However, when they are only moderately weird, they can become serious social risks. Baldwin had both risk factors. First, he had family wealth and social status, which gave him the means by which to be dangerous, and secondly, he was moderately weird, which, making for a sense of personal inadequacy, fueled his drive toward social activism.

Needless to say, he took his bachelor’s from Harvard. Being a Harvard graduate adds a third risk factor. With all these risk factors, we could say that he was statistically doomed to become dangerous to the world as we know it. Why must society suffer because of social misfits? Marx was one; Stalin was another. An old friend of mine referred to the activities of these weirdos as “The Revolt of the Dwarves.” She was on the money.

A review of the names of the first ten founders of the ACLU in 1920 gives nine well-known WASP aristocrats, and Felix Frankfurter, apparently the lone Jew. The reason for concentrating on Baldwin is that he was to be the executive director from then until 1950. He set the tone.

Baldwin expressed his personal views in an autobiographical sketch in 1935 for his Harvard class reunion. Please recall that we are reading the opinion of a man who never had to work for a living: if he chose to work, he was always aware that he could quit at a moment’s notice—for him real work was “slumming.”

My chief aversion is the system of greed, private profit, privilege, and violence which makes up the control of the world today, and which has brought it the tragic crisis of unprecedented hunger and unemployment. I am opposed to the new deal [sic] because it strives to strengthen and prolong production for private profit. At bottom I am for conserving the full powers of every person on earth by expanding them to their individual limits. Therefore, I am for socialism, disarmament, and ultimately for abolishing the State itself as an instrument of property, the abolition of the propertied class and sole control by those who produce wealth. Communism is the goal. It sums up into one single purpose—the abolition of the system of dog-eat-dog under which we live, and the substitution by the most effective non-violence possible of a system of cooperative ownership and use of all wealth.⁴

We now know what Baldwin believes. What is the role of civil liberties to him and those like him? The answer is implied above. He has an end: Marxism. He has a means- Civil liberties: “Civil liberties, like democracy, are useful tools for social change.”⁵

Baldwin's long-standing personal secretary (and sometime mistress), Lucille Milner, (née Lowenstein) reflects the same attitude: "Milner viewed civil liberties not as an end in themselves, but as 'a means to an end. What I was interested in was to abolish poverty, not the right to say that poverty is horrible.'"6

Let us look more closely at the ends. According to the theory of Marx and Engels, the task of the revolutionary is to destroy the entire culture of existing society. That means especially the family (see Engel's *Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*), and any laws or traditions that might lend support to family or any other normative community behavior. The matter that brought this issue to a head was that of obscenity. In 1926, the Boston Watch and Ward Society tried to ban *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. There was a curious split in the ACLU on this issue. Baldwin, Norman Thomas, and John Haynes Holmes were unwilling to take on the issue. Their belief was that free speech issues should deal with politics and not involve pornography. However, the Jewish members of the ACLU Board of Directors (Arthur Garfield Hays and Morris Ernst) took the opposite view. Apparently the non-Jews needed a refresher course in Marxist praxis from a pair of bona fide "secularized Jews."7

There are many things the ACLU does in order to support the illusion that it is concerned with civil rights. For example, about a decade ago it supported the rights of Nazis to parade in Skokie, Illinois, at that time the home of numerous Holocaust survivors. But that action was pure window dressing on the part of the ACLU, as Nazis pose no real threat in this country. It was a calculated ploy to deceive. On the other hand, on real issues, such as racial preferences, they follow a straight Communist/Jewish Left line. Also, their support of the Bill of Rights is highly selective: they would like to trash the Second Amendment, consistent with the dictates of the Jewish Left.

The membership list and donor list for the ACLU is not subject to popular review. Thus I cannot prove that today, as opposed to 1920, the vast majority of members are drawn from the Jewish Left. But I believe it is so. I also believe that the greatest amount of funding comes from the Jewish Left. I believe this because the ACLU is the single most powerful weapon possessed by the Jewish Left in their crusade to destroy America as we know it and to rebuild it into a Communist state. They would never use the term "Communist" because it has too much blood on it. They have other euphemisms such as "progressive" or "fair" or "a just society." These are all sanitized terms to mislead the gullible and those who wish to be misled.

The Piranhas

It is obvious that the shark is lethal. A close look at a piranha shows a fish, small in size, but with fearsome teeth. A single piranha is not a lethal threat to a man. But piranhas travel in packs, and as such, are more certainly lethal than the lone shark. So, if you, dear Reader, will turn to Appendix I, you will see a list of about 500 liberal advocacy groups. They range from Americans Coming Together to ZNet's Latin World Watch. What the vast majority of these groups have in common is a Socialist agenda. They have interlocking directorates. Many of them come across as innocent study groups or victims' support groups. They make use of high-sounding words in their names, such as "American," "human rights," and "democracy." Their core supporters are relatively few, but because these core supporters join many such groups, the groups present with an

exaggerated membership base. This is useful for influencing legislators. These groups are well funded. Probably the best-known of the groups is the (partially) Soros-funded moveon.org.

Because they frequently use patriotic-sounding names, or names indicative of high civic purpose, their true nature is disguised. In the main, they seek to limit liberty by the usual liberal transfer techniques. That is, transfer of authority from regional to central organs of government and concomitant increase in the popular tax burden. They stress entitlements rather than liberty, consistent with the usual left-wing way of buying votes. In the end, we, the people, have neither freedom nor security.

The Congress of the U.S. has the authority to investigate matters of grave import to the country. This includes the responsibility to investigate fraud and treason. Just such an incidence of massive deceit was the subject of the Nye Committee hearings following World War I. After World War I ended, Americans saw that the high ideals and lofty goals that led us into a European War were more illusory than real. A period of isolationism set in. One of the key factors that fueled the spirit of isolationism following World War I resulted from popular revulsion to wholesale war profiteering. Between 1934 and 1936, Senator Gerald Nye and his Senate Committee showed that many munitions manufacturers took enormous profits from both sides, even during the war itself. He demonstrated an amoral culture in which merchants of death were equal opportunity players. He demonstrated the existence of a small group of corrupt men who put their personal interests above that of our nation. These people were able to manipulate events so that they always came out ahead.

I believe we are experiencing something like that in the U.S. today. We have a small group of people skilled at manipulating public opinion. These people transfer huge amounts of money among various puppet organizations that function as this small group dictates. The members of this small group prefer to work behind the scenes. The organizations they control work in concert to promote particular candidates. This small group is the Jewish Left. A primary example is moveon.org, a tool provided to the Clintons by this group.

It is not only the Jewish Left that seeks to destroy liberty. It is also the Protestant Left. It too, is involved in every aspect of public policy and private life. One of the chief organs of the Protestant Left is the foundation. We have a Campaign Finance Reform Act to limit influence just prior to national elections, but there is no limit on foundation influence on public opinion. The work of foundations goes on throughout the election cycle. The subtle and not so subtle influence of the foundations exceeds by far all the combined monies in campaign contributions. Think for a moment of the monies disbursed by the large, old-line foundations such as the Ford, Carnegie, Robert Wood Johnson, and Rockefeller Foundations, just to name a few. How can we measure their impact? To whom must they answer for their impact on public policy? Now consider the expenditures of the myriad of smaller, newer, purpose-bred organizations. Is the sum of their assets any less than that of their older brothers? Is it greater?

Do we have manipulation that reaches the point of conspiracy? Is there violation of the tax code? Or is this array of captive organizations within the boundary of the law? Since

so much is at stake, I believe it is an area that can and should be subject to congressional investigation.

Because I was interested to see what influence the Jewish Left might exert by means of non-profit organizations, I ran an experiment. I went online and used the search engine Google to obtain a list of liberal organizations. The Web site I used was www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=list_of_progressive_organizations. I obtained the list in Appendix I on August 22, 2007. I made an attempt to determine the number of such organizations that were largely funded by or established by members of the Jewish Left. See Appendix II for study design.

My results show that between 37 and 58 percent met the criteria I set out; that is, that these organizations are the products of a small, well-financed, and influential minority: the Jewish Left

It is a grave disappointment to me that so many who should be so grateful are so hostile to the nation that saved them. This is one more example of

Savage Ingratitude.

1 American National Biography Online, Feb. 2000. sv “Roger Nash Baldwin,”

<http://www.anb.org/articles/15/15-00733.html>

2 Ibid., sv “Crystal Eastman.”

3 Ibid., sv “Roger Nash Baldwin.”

4 Robert C. Cottrell, *Roger Nash Baldwin and the American Civil Liberties Union* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), 228–229.

5 Ibid., 213.

6 Ibid., 308.

7 Ibid., 166.

CHAPTER 36

TRIUMPH OF DECEIT

In the U.S., Deceit triumphed in two ways by the middle of the twentieth century. First, the Soviets were successful in espionage, and then, in the late fifties, they were able to conceal their deceit by discrediting as “McCarthyism” any attempt to expose the harm they had done. Their espionage cadres were usually American citizens who were recruited or had volunteered to betray their own country. The vast majority of these traitors were Jews. In appendix A of *Venona: Decoding Soviet Espionage in America* is a list of Americans and U.S. residents who had covert connections with the USSR.¹ If their family names sound like the membership list of a synagogue, that is not surprising, as I have shown how Communism is a religion to these people.

Espionage

As I pointed out in chapter 31, Roosevelt’s New Deal agencies served as an entry point for many of these spies. The old-line agencies, such as the State Department, were infiltrated by the few non-Jews in the spy rings. The State Department, as an old-line

agency, had some of the residual anti-Semitism common to the elite of that era. This was one instance in which anti-Semitism served to protect the country!

There were two major spy rings in the U.S. during the New Deal. One was the “Perlo Ring.” It infiltrated mid-level positions in the Roosevelt administration.² Some of its members (other than Victor Perlo himself) were John Abt, Edward Fitzgerald, Charles Kramer, Nathan Witt, and Henry Collins.³ A list of some of the data sent to the USSR by this group is given on page 231 of *The Haunted Wood*, by Weinstein and Vassiliev.

The second group, referred to as the Silvermaster Group, included Gregory Silvermaster, his wife Helen, William Ullmann, Solomon Adler, William Taylor, George Silvermaster, Frank Coe, William Gold, Sonia Gold, Irving Kaplan, Norman Bursler, Lauchlin Currie, Anatole Volkov, and Harry Dexter White.⁴ This group targeted FDR’s closest associates, such as Harry Hopkins and Henry Morgenthau. The purpose was to make FDR more receptive to Soviet goals in postwar Europe. Moscow indicated this goal in a dispatch in April, 1942: “We are interested in the [U.S.] government’s plans for the country’s foreign and domestic policy...The task is to penetrate into those places where policy is born and developed, where discussions and debates take place, where policy is completed.”⁵ At the Yalta Conference, Roosevelt allowed Stalin to occupy Poland, “temporarily,” pending free elections. Is that gift to Stalin courtesy of American traitors?⁶ Also at Yalta there was another agreement between Roosevelt and Stalin that led to an episode of enormous human suffering. Stalin was suspicious of his returning POWs and also of Soviet citizens who had been exposed to the West. He feared that they would be “potential spies, or at least...contaminated by their stay outside of the Soviet Union.”⁷ Below is a passage recording their fate:

Once the Yalta accords had been signed, convoys left Britain weekly for the USSR. From May to July, 1945 more than 1.3 million people who had been living in the Western zones, and who were considered Russian by the British, including people from the Balkans, which had been annexed in 1940, and the Ukrainians, were repatriated. By the end of August more than 2 million of these “Russians” had been handed over. Sometimes they were kept in terrible conditions. Individual and collective suicides involving whole families were frequent, as was mutilation. Often, when the prisoners were handed over to the Soviet authorities, they tried to put up passive resistance, but the Anglo-Americans did not hesitate to use force to satisfy Moscow’s requirement. When the prisoners arrived in the USSR, they were placed under police control. The day the ship *Almanzora* arrived in Odessa, on 18 April, summary executions took place. This was also the case when the *Empire Pride* arrived in the Black Sea.⁸

Early in the war years, the U.S. and USSR had a common interest in defeating the Axis powers. Thus, Adolf Berle, Assistant Secretary of State, decided to develop joint intelligence with the USSR in order to be more effective against the common enemies, Germany and Japan. To meet this need, the Office of Strategic Services was founded in 1942. It was supposed to work closely with the Soviet intelligence agency, the NKVD. The Soviets considered this arrangement a great opportunity to infiltrate American intelligence for anti-American, as well as anti-Axis purposes. It did not take the Soviets long to achieve this goal. The OSS hired several German-Jewish refugees, whose hostility to Nazism was beyond doubt. But some of them were, or became, Soviet spies, thus betraying the country that saved them. One such individual was Franz Neumann.⁹

Another Jewish Marxist in the OSS was Herbert Marcuse. Although there is no indication that he was a spy, his influence through the New Left was more destructive than outright espionage. The value of espionage is time sensitive; the results of political poison bear fruit for generations.

Although time sensitive, the espionage did exact its price in American blood. In order to make real the impact of this espionage on everyday Americans, I will cite the probable consequences of one instance of this espionage on American soldiers and airmen. At the onset of the Korean War, North Korean and Communist Chinese pilots had the MiG-15, a better fighter plane than anything we had. This technological disadvantage caused the unnecessary deaths of American pilots and the ground forces who depended upon air support. The spy enabling the Communists in this instance was William Perl.¹⁰ Even worse was the betrayal of atomic secrets by Klaus Fuchs and Theodore Hall from the Manhattan project. Stalin's premature possession of the atom bomb changed the balance of power in Korea: "The killing and maiming of hundreds of thousands of soldiers and civilians on both sides of the war in Korea might have been averted had the Soviets not been able to parry the American bomb threat."¹¹ Perl, Fuchs and Hall were Jews. Does the Jewish community have any comment?

Deceit

The Jewish Left was well aware of the degree of espionage and infiltration that the Communist Party and the Soviet NKVD and GRU had achieved. The most effective way that they found to camouflage the degree of penetration was to make it appear that those who noticed the penetration were right-wing extremists. They were able to turn the tables and make the defenders of liberty appear to be the enemies of liberty.

This task was made easier by the fateful arrival of Joseph McCarthy in the U.S. Senate in 1946. He was to become the self-appointed messenger of anti-Communism. The messenger, however, was seriously flawed. He was an alcoholic and willing to use the issue of Communist infiltration as a means of gathering personal political power. In the process, he made many enemies of people who might have been open to the fundamental truth of his arguments had he not been a demagogue. If the Jewish Left had possessed the power to invent an enemy, they could not have done better than fate alone had done in providing Joe McCarthy. By discrediting the messenger, they were able to discredit the message.

But the Jewish Left did more than just to discredit McCarthy and his message in its era. They were able to convert him into a symbol, which, through their control of the media, has endured to this day. It is still an effective shield protecting the predatory forces of Judeofascism in its continual assault upon liberty. A glance at any high school textbook will show the prominence given to the McCarthy era, with little or no data about Soviet espionage. Who writes the textbooks? Howard Zinn, a Judeofascist whose work we will subsequently examine, has written a textbook entitled *A People's History of America*. This book is popular with the educational establishment because it is violently anti-American. It is nothing more than a left-wing propaganda treatise formalizing the ideology of the Jewish Left for high school consumption. A trip to the local library will turn up Arthur Miller's play *The Crucible*, which was a high-brow propaganda assault on McCarthy. The daily newspapers will use the term McCarthyism when attacking anyone

who questions the Left or its motivation. This is true today and reveals who controls the print media right now.

The major problem faced by McCarthy and his supporters in the late forties and early fifties of the last century was the difficulty of proving that what they knew to be true was, in actual fact, true. They could have easily demonstrated the degree of Communist infiltration in government agencies had the Venona documents been made public at that time.

At this point I will briefly digress from McCarthy to explain the Venona documents. In 1943, Col. Carter Clarke of U.S. Military Intelligence had begun a project to decode all the Soviet cable traffic he could find. Using the services of many brilliant young cryptographers in the U.S. and England, he had some success. We succeeded in decoding about 3000 messages, despite the constantly changing Soviet encoding procedures.¹² But this was still only a small fraction of the total coded traffic, on the whole, probably not more than 5 to 7 percent. Noting the leaks in the White House, Military Intelligence told neither Roosevelt nor Truman of the successful project. Instead, they filtered the necessary information to the White House in such a way as to protect the project.¹³ Unfortunately, that indirect procedure detracted, in some measure, from the power the data would otherwise have had. The total number of American citizens noted to have covert connections to the Soviets was 349.¹⁴ If we could have decoded a greater percentage of the messages, the number of spies uncovered could only have been greater.

The information derived from the Venona Project was instrumental not only in identifying Soviet agents, but also in prosecuting them. The problem was that the actual Soviet cables could not be referred to without endangering the whole Venona Project. Thus in many cases, such as the Alger Hiss and Julius and Ethyl Rosenberg cases, public knowledge of the project could have led to easier convictions. Instead, the prosecution had to proceed with more circumstantial data. This complication served only to provide the Jewish Left with more ammunition in its campaign against American justice.

It is only in the context of understanding the enormity of the Soviet infiltration of government agencies that the loyalty oaths and security measures of the 1950s can be properly understood. Also, the Smith Act, requiring members of the American Communist Party to register as agents of a foreign government was absolutely justified, as the CPUSA was an active participant in Soviet espionage. (There are too many instances of CPUSA serving Soviet espionage purposes to permit a reference here. Interested parties are referred to the index of Haynes and Klehr: Venona). Incidentally, it was not until 1987 that the Venona Project was declassified.¹⁵

Now we can return to the history of Joe McCarthy and his era. McCarthy's career as a factor in American political life began in Wheeling, West Virginia. He gave a speech there, which was not recorded, so there is some question regarding the details. The key phrase that launched McCarthy into the national spotlight was his statement "I have here in my hand a list of 205—a list of names that were made known to the Secretary of State as being members of the Communist Party and who nevertheless are still working in the State Department."¹⁶ To this day no one knows what, if any, list he actually had. However, if he'd had the Venona list, he could have ticked off several at the State Department and many more at other departments. History remembers him for the above

passage, but he also said something much more important in the same speech. He repeated some lines previously spoken by Richard Nixon, which shows Nixon's great understanding of the Communist threat: "One thing to remember when discussing Communists in our government is that we are not dealing with spies who get thirty pieces of silver to obtain the blueprint of a new weapon. We are dealing with a far more sinister type of activity because it permits the enemy to guide and shape our policy."¹⁷ I am not certain whether McCarthy was aware of the importance of what Nixon said in the above quote. For McCarthy it may have been the mindless recitation of words because they seemed appropriate to the time, place, and prosody of his own speech.

With the passage of time, McCarthy became a source of power that was a threat to Democrats and Republicans. He was almost isolated in the Senate. However, had he not had widespread popular support from Americans of all states and both parties, McCarthy would have had no power. His popular support shows that on the issue of the Communist threat to the U.S., the people of the United States were far more in touch with reality than the politicians. The task for the Left was not simply to destroy McCarthy the man and the Senator, but to discredit the message. In this they were successful.

In conclusion, I would like to remark that while most of the spies and masters of deceit were Jews, some very important ones were not. A key example is Harry Hopkins, advisor to FDR, and probably the man closest to him. Hopkins was also a favorite of Eleanor Roosevelt. His activities and their consequences are related by Romerstein and Breindel (*The Venona Secrets*). First, they give evidence of Hopkins' ties to the USSR: "Two Venona messages from Belyaev to the Soviet leadership contained messages to them from Hopkins."¹⁸ There is much additional proof, but space precludes my citing it. The consequences, however, are too important to skip. In 1944, the Poles in Warsaw were preparing an uprising against the Nazi occupiers. They pled with Britain and the U.S. to airdrop supplies. But Stalin opposed supplying the Poles with arms, because he knew armed Poles would not be receptive to replacing the Nazis by the Russians. As a dutiful Russian tool, Hopkins promised to block all cables to Roosevelt that would support arming the Poles: "According to Anderson [deputy commanding general for operations, U. S. Strategic Air Force in Europe] Hopkins said 'that he would see that any cablegrams whether they came from Mr. Churchill or from Mr. Winant [U. S. ambassador in London] would be held in abeyance and that we would not be committed to do this job.'"¹⁹

In closing this chapter, I wish to point out that most of the authors of the books regarding the Venona Project are Jews. This is an important redeeming point that should not be overlooked in a global assessment of the troubling issues raised in this chapter.

1 John Earl Haynes and Harvey Klehr, *Venona: Decoding Soviet Espionage in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).

2 Allen Weinstein and Alexander Vassiliev, *The Haunted Wood* (New York: Random House, 1999), 224.

3 *Ibid.*, 227.

4 Haynes and Klehr, 129.

5 Weinstein and Vassiliev, 160.

6 *Ibid.*, 269.

7 Mark Greenberg, et al., eds. *The Black Book of Communism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 230.

8 *Ibid.*, 320.

9 Weinstein and Vassiliev, 249.

10 Haynes and Klehr, 10.

11 *Ibid.*, 11.

12 *Ibid.*, 35.

13 *Ibid.*, 15.

14 *Ibid.*, 9.

15 *Ibid.*, 5.

16 Robert Griffith, *The Politics of Fear* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987), 49.

17 *Ibid.*, 48.

18 Herbert Romerstein and Eric Breindel, *The Venona Secrets* (Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2000), 213.

19 *Ibid.*, 217–218.

CHAPTER 37

HOLOCAUST/HOLODOMOR

This chapter deals mainly with the Holocaust—no, not the one you are thinking of. This chapter deals with the one that occurred less than ten years before the Holocaust. I am referring to the massive murder of at least 5 million human beings by the Communist regime of the USSR under Joseph Stalin. The Ukrainian term for it is Holodomor, which means death by hunger.¹ During the years 1931–1932, Stalin decided to destroy a nation:

Fifty years ago, as I write these words, the Ukraine and the Ukrainian, Cossack and other areas to its east—a great stretch of territory with some forty million inhabitants—was like one vast Belsen. A quarter of the rural population, men, women and children, lay dead or dying, the rest in various stages of debilitation with no strength to bury their families or neighbors. At the same time, (as at Belsen), well-fed squads of police or party officials supervised the victims...

On a battlefield men die quickly, they fight back; they are sustained by fellowship and a sense of duty. Here I saw people dying in solitude by slow degrees, dying hideously, without the excuse of sacrifice for a cause. They had been trapped and left to starve, each in his home, by a political decision made in a far-off capital around conference and banquet table. There was not even the consolation of inevitability to relieve the horror.

The most terrifying sights were the little children with the skeleton limbs dangling from balloon-like abdomens. Starvation had wiped every trace of youth from their faces, turning them into tortured gargoyles; only in their eyes still lingered the reminder of childhood. Everywhere we found men and women lying prone, their faces and bellies bloated, their eyes utterly expressionless...

The clinical picture of famine is well-known. It ruins the energy—producing resources of the human system, advancing as the necessary fats and sugars are withheld. The body withers. The skin assumes a dust-grey tinge and folds into many creases. The person ages visibly. Even small children and infants have an old look. Their eyes become large, bulging and immobile. The process of dystrophy sometimes affects all the tissues and the sufferer resembles a skeleton covered with tightly-drawn skin. But a swelling of tissues is more common, especially those of the hands, feet and face. Skin erupts over the swelling and festering sores persist. Motive power is lost, the slightest motion producing complete fatigue. The essential functions of life-breathing and circulation, consume the body's own tissue and albumin, the body consumes itself. Respiration and heart beat become accelerated. The pupils dilate, starvation diarrhea sets in. This condition is already dangerous because the slightest physical exertion induces heart failure. It often takes place while the sufferer is walking, climbing the stairs, or attempting to run. General weakness spreads. The patient cannot get up, nor move in bed. In a condition of semi-conscious sleep he might last about a week, whereupon the heart stops beating.²

What was happening here? Since the Mongol invasions of the thirteenth century, no such massive, planned human destruction had occurred in Europe. With the close of the First World War, something new came into existence. In previous wars civilians may have been victims, but they were not commonly targeted as such. Even on the battlefields a sort of chivalry prevailed, with a certain respect for the enemy. There were even occasional informal truces at Christmas and New Years. A sense of this chivalry can be seen in Jean Renoirs' film *Grand Illusion*, which takes place during World War I.

But with the advent of Marxism, a new view of the "enemy" had developed. The enemy was a "class." As a class, the enemy had a culture, systems of belief. Defeat of the enemy on the battlefield was merely the beginning. It was imperative to destroy his way of living, his way of thinking, his religion, his internal value structure. He had to be remade. The Communist dictatorship took over the role of God, to remake man in the image of the Marxist ideal. In the event that any person could not be so changed, that person, or those persons, or those classes of persons, had to be "liquidated." This mass murder was perpetrated in order to create a utopian society. Those individuals, who, even unknowingly, stood in the way of this quest to Utopia, had to be removed for the greater good of all. That was the theoretical basis upon which the Holodomor was executed.

It was obvious that Stalin, ensconced in the Kremlin, could not do the job himself. To carry out the mass murder, he appointed Lazar Kaganovitch. This butcher of humans was born a Jew and early on became a Communist. He became a slavish sycophant to Joseph Stalin, thus winning Stalin's favor by his willingness to commit mass murder as readily as another would be to harvest wheat. He was backed up by a corps of junior commissars. How many of these commissars were Jews? I don't know. What I do know is that in Poland, Germany, and Hungary, as shown in previous chapters, the leading Communists were Jews. It is unlikely that the situation here was any different. In the Congress of the United States, on Oct. 21, 2003, House Concurrent Resolution #356 passed the House by vote of 382-0. In addressing this question, it read, in part:

When OGPU failed to meet execution quotas, Stalin sent henchman Lazar Kaganovitch to destroy Ukrainian resistance. Kaganovitch, the Soviet Eichmann, made quota, shooting 10,000 Ukrainians weekly. Eighty percent of all Ukrainian intellectuals were executed...

Kaganovitch and many senior officers (later, NKVD) were Jewish. The predominance of Jews among Bolshevik leaders, and the frightful crimes and cruelty inflicted by Stalin's Cheka on Ukraine, the Baltic states, and Poland, led the victims of Red terror to blame the Jewish people for both Communism and their suffering. As a direct result, during the subsequent Nazi occupation of Eastern Europe, the region's innocent Jew became the target of ferocious revenge by Ukrainian, Balts and Poles.

While the world is by now fully aware of the destruction of Europe's Jews by the Nazis, the story of the numerically larger holocaust in Ukraine has been suppressed, or ignored. Ukraine's genocide occurred 8–9 years before Hitler began the Jewish Holocaust, and was committed, unlike Nazi crimes, before the world's gaze. But Stalin's murder of millions was simply denied, or concealed by a left-wing conspiracy of silence that continues to this day. In the strange moral geometry of mass murder, only Nazis are guilty.³

The words from the passage above, "as a direct result, during the subsequent Nazi occupation of Eastern Europe, the region's innocent Jew became the target of ferocious revenge by Ukrainian, Balts, and Poles," requires a comment from me. As mentioned earlier, there is a saying among conservative Jews such as myself, which states Trotsky makes the revolution; Bronstein pays the price. This saying makes sense if you remember that Trotsky was an even greater butcher than Kaganovitch, and that Trotsky's name was Bronstein, before he ethnically cleansed it.

Before one starts out exterminating people, two things must be seen to. First, the victims must be unarmed, and secondly, the killing crews must be convinced that the victims are subhumans. As a result of liberal control of the media, most people think the Nazis invented the two-step process above. Actually, it was a Communist invention that the Nazis merely copied. During the years 1929–1930, the people were disarmed. Now for step two; the Communist death squads

would threaten people with guns, as if they were under a spell, calling small children "kulak bastards," screaming Bloodsuckers!" They had sold themselves on the idea that the so-called "kulaks" were pariahs, untouchable, vermin. They would not sit down at a "parasite's" table; the "kulak" child was loathsome, the young "kulak" girl was lower than a louse. They looked on the so-called "kulaks" as cattle, swine, loathsome, repulsive: they had no souls; they were not human beings; one had a hard time making out what they were—vermin, evidently.⁴

This characterization of certain people as subhuman is a direct result of Marxist ideology. With the abnegation of any overriding value system, with the abolition of any difference between right and wrong or good and evil, anything is possible. An Englishman once said "the problem with those who do not believe in God is not that they believe in nothing, but that they will believe in anything." It was the Communists who introduced this nihilism; the Nazis merely continued it.

Not only in Ukraine have we seen this evil. Communist regimes in Cambodia, China, and North Korea have done the same.

Holodomor Denial

Unlike the Jewish Left, which controls the media, Ukrainians have little influence in how history is perceived. And, in the end, popular judgments of what actually happened in the past (“history”) are the result of the consensus of historians. In that sense, history is not that which has occurred, but that which historians say has occurred. History, thus distorted, is a product of present endeavor, rather than a record of past events. To the Soviet historian, the passage of an event from present to past does not serve to fix the event in time as a *fait accompli*. The sacredness of the past has been annulled. The historical event may be changed at any time to conform to present need. This plasticity of truth is what underpins contemporary “political correctness.” What was invented in Moscow is now practiced in New York and Boston.

The most egregious example of Holodomor denial was the series of articles written from Ukraine for the New York Times, a Jewish-owned and controlled newspaper then, as it is today. This series was written by Walter Duranty who was on-site in Ukraine as the events unfolded. He was Stalin’s puppet, or more accurately, Stalin’s transcriptionist. For this Duranty received the Pulitzer Prize in 1932. (Incidentally, Joseph Pulitzer, who established the Prize, was a Jew.)⁵ In 2003, the New York Times, in a belated attempt at damage control, asked the Pulitzer Board to consider whether the prize should be revoked.⁶ The Board’s reasoning is truly astounding:

In its review of the 13 articles, [written by Duranty] the Board determined that Mr. Duranty’s 1931 work, measured by today’s standards for foreign reporting, falls seriously short.

What a pack of lies! Look at the bias in the media today. The mainstream media has an enduring love affair with Fidel Castro and Cuban Communism! Havana, with its perfect health care system, is the New Jerusalem of the Jewish Left. Today’s standards for foreign reporting are no different from those of Duranty’s time.

In that regard, the Board’s view is similar to that of the New York Times itself and of some scholars who have examined his 1931 reports.

It is not surprising that the Board agrees with the NYT. They are both infested with Jewish Leftists. They may not be composed of the same people, but they share a common mind.

However, the Board determined that there was not clear and convincing evidence of deliberate deception, the relevant standard in this case.

If that is true, why has the Board not awarded Hitler’s Minister of Propaganda, Josef Goebbels, a Pulitzer Prize? His work was equally devoid of “deliberate deception.”

Revoking a prize 71 years after it was awarded under different circumstances, when all the principles are dead and unable to respond...

The different circumstances reflect the traditional denial of a difference between good and evil, the basic premise of Marxism. The Board apparently subscribes to this doctrine. The reason they are dead and unable to respond is because Duranty’s employer, Stalin, had them slain. The Jewish Left did not apply the same criteria (“all the principles are dead and unable to respond”) during the Eichmann trial! Documentary evidence is admissible when trying Nazis, but is not admissible when trying Communists! The usual Judeofascist bias...

Would be a momentous step and therefore would have to rise to that threshold.

What arrogance! The majesty of the Board, a collection of self-congratulating crypto-Marxists, eclipses the horrific slaughter of 5 million civilians!

The above noted, it would be a serious error to attribute intentional deception to the Jewish Left and its minions alone. The cream of British and French intellectuals served the same function as Stalin's willing accomplices.⁷ (The use of the term dupes would be wrong, because these intellectuals were aware of their deceit.)

Comparison: Holodomor and Holocaust

Despite the similarity of the horror to the victims of both tragedies, there are some telling differences in how they were and still are perceived. The occurrence of the Holodomor is still considered a subject of debate in academic circles; the Holocaust is not only beyond debate, but to question it in some countries, e.g. France and Germany, is a criminal act! When they occurred, both the Holodomor and the Holocaust were open-and-closed secrets. That is to say, their actualities were never publicly admitted or discussed, but their occurrence was common knowledge. Following World War II, the "I didn't know" defense was considered laughable when used by accused Germans, but is honored when used by accused Communists. Comparing the Holodomor and the Holocaust leads us to compare Kaganovitch to Eichmann. Both were the willing tools of evil dictators. But while the world is aware of and vilifies Eichmann, almost no one would recognize the name Kaganovitch. History is written by the winners.

All over the world, and in many major U.S. cities, there are Holocaust Memorials. How many such memorials are there in the U.S. for the Holodomor? The absence of such memorials is due both to the unwillingness of Jews to share their status as victims, as well as the inconvenient questions regarding the role of Jews as perpetrators. The Jewish identity as unique and uniquely victims has its uses.

Another defense against considering the Holodomor as a manifestation of evil, is that Communists and Socialists believe that it was done as a "noble experiment." As such, there may have been errors, but they were done with the best of intentions. Many non-Jews took this line. One of the most notable, because he was so typical of his class, was Noel Field.⁸ He came from an old New England Protestant family, went to Harvard, and had all the connections necessary to advance in public service. So he became a Communist spy, planted in the U.S. State Department. He was, in Stalin's famous phrase, "a useful idiot." There were many such from among the New England Protestant elite.

None of this perversion of truth could have occurred if the chattering classes in the U.S. and Europe had not first been intoxicated with the vapors of Marxism that floated out from Germany. We have traced the Frankfurt School, as it went from Germany to the U.S. With the victory of Nazi arms in Europe and the accompanying extermination of European Jewry, the Jewish Left suffered a serious setback in Europe. But one of the consequences of their fleeing Europe was to plant the disease of Marxism firmly into American academia. Today we call it "political correctness." Under this thought system, genocide and mass murder are quite different things. Genocide has as its victims members of a specific race; hence it is morally reprehensible. Mass murder, on the other hand, does not discriminate on the basis of race. It discriminates on the basis of class, as

in Ukraine, where, theoretically, it was only the “kulak,” or independent peasant, that was exterminated. Thus mass murder, as opposed to genocide, may be excused, because it is done with laudable intent; that is, to make a “workers’ paradise.” When there is an overriding greater good, mass murder is excusable.

In 1963, in Israel, a memorial was established. It is called Yad Vashem. Its purpose is to honor “the Righteous Among Nations,” that is, to honor the non-Jews who risked their lives saving Jews during the Holocaust. It is the height of human spirituality to risk one’s life to save others, and no memorial can provide the honor due to the best of our species. But if you read interviews with these “Righteous Gentiles,” you will find that they did not save Jews because the victims were Jews; they saved Jews because Jews are human. Mirroring the role of the Righteous Gentiles, there were, in the Ukraine, some Righteous Jews, who did what they could to save Ukrainians. These people have never been honored and have died in obscurity. Why? There are many reasons. A sufficient reason would be that to honor them would risk bringing to light the role of other Jews, Jews such as Kaganovitch.

The Late Holocaust: Perfidy

By 1944, the Second World War was almost over. The only remaining pool of Jews in Eastern Europe was the one million Jews of Hungary. Due to the resistance of Admiral Horthy, the ruler of Hungary, these Jews were relatively safe. But in early 1944, the Nazis took over direct control of Hungary, placing the last million directly in harm’s way. However, in mid 1944, a chance of rescue arose for the one million.

Prior to relating the history of the last million, we need to review the makeup of the Jewish community in the United States, Israel, and Western Europe. It is basically split between the orthodox, who follow tradition, and the reform and assimilated types who do not. From the assimilated types we get the Jewish Left, starting with Karl Marx, and continuing on to today’s iterations of him. The Jewish Left hates all religion, and Judaism is no exception. So when the issue of saving the one million arose, the fact that most of them were orthodox sharply reduced their value in the eyes of the Jewish establishment, whose political views ranged from moderate Socialist to hard-line Communist. To this Marxist-impregnated leadership, the orthodox were chaff, and not only dispensable, but undesirable. Chaim Weizman, the highest ranking Jewish leader of his day, assessed them as follows: “They are moral and economic dust...in a cruel world...They must meet their fate...Only a branch shall survive. They must accept it.”⁹ Chaim Cohen, a colleague and friend of Weizman, and future Israeli Supreme Court justice, had this to say:

For those and millions of Jews like them there came true the old curse: “And lo, they were meant but to be taken like sheep for slaughter, for killing, for destruction, for crushing and shame.” There was no spirit in them. The Jewish masses in Warsaw were in the same condition.¹⁰

Having this background, we can return to the remaining million. The German government issued an offer to the Jewish Agency. The offer was to exchange the million Jews for certain commodities. Since the Jewish Agency did not want to rescue the million, they hid the offer. They practiced deceit at every level. The history of this event is related in the Ben Hecht’s book *Perfidy*, which I highly recommend.

Related to the issue of saving the Hungarian Jews, and actually anterior to that issue, was the issue of where to put the millions of eventual and actual victims of the Nazis. The only place on earth where they could have gone would have been Palestine, which had been set aside for Jewish settlement in 1918 by the British. (At the time Britain had a mandate from the League of Nations to administer Palestine.) However, during the late twenties and early thirties, the British faced Arab hostility to Jewish settlement and put severe limitations of the number of Jewish immigrants to Palestine. This limitation occurred at precisely the time just before and during the Holocaust.

The catastrophic slaughter resulting from the simultaneous occurrence of mass murder and closure of escape routes led to a massive campaign in the U.S. to influence the American government to pressure the British to reopen the only escape route that existed. Many prominent people signed a petition to that effect. They included thirty-three Senators, one hundred and nine Representatives, fourteen state governors, hundreds of rabbis, priests, and ministers, a score of admirals and generals, and far too many others to enumerate.¹¹ But there was a terrible, bloody secret. Among the leaders of U.S. Jewry, the “Respectables” did not want to see the gates to Israel opened to “those” Jews!¹² Palestine was to be settled by followers of Marx, not Moses.

Most of our high-powered cohorts and endorsers were Gentiles. Out of the five thousand important Names we were able to pipe to our side, hardly a handful were Important Jewish names.

Thus our Gentile Captains of a Thousand, after winning a battle, felt it their duty to step aside modestly, and permit the Jewish leaders of the land to finish the victory. We could convince our Gentiles of our cause, but we could seldom convince them that all the fine American Jews whom they admired were enemies of our cause.¹³

It is almost beyond belief that the “Respectables” would betray their own people, but betray them they did. It is not coincidental that the descendents of these “Respectables” comprise today’s Jewish Left. Their spiritual ancestor is Judas Iscariot. It is this group of “Despicables” who are now ceaselessly chattering about the Holocaust. Why?

Uses of the Holocaust

There is a very clear answer to the question why. The Jewish Left is about the business of deconstructing America as we know it. The Jewish Left needs a patent of immunity in order to protect itself from the richly deserved opprobrium it would suffer if it had no shield. So it calls up the blood of the 6 million whom it allowed to be slaughtered, as a shield against the justified anger of decent Americans who see their culture transformed on a daily basis. And what a shield it is! Every schoolchild knows about the Holocaust (but has never heard of the Holodomor). Every child has heard of Eichmann, but not of Kaganovitch. The very term Holocaust has become a synonym for unmitigated evil; the name Eichmann has become synonymous with mass murder. There is no high school history text that does not mention the Holocaust, and none that does mention the Holodomor. The most racist creatures alive on the earth today are the Jewish Left.

But the evil is even more subtle. The Jewish Left have created a new category of crime. It is called a hate crime, and augments the penalty of an act already defined as criminal, if it can be maintained that the motive for the crime was, at least in part, due to racial

differences. The moral weight of Christian guilt for the Holocaust was used to pass this legislation. Criminal assault on a person of a different class is not considered a hate crime, because mass murder on the basis of class is a standard Marxist practice; the Jewish Left in Europe have used class difference as a basis to carry out mass exterminations. In a rational society governed by rational law, a criminal act would be just that, regardless of the victim's race. What the Jewish Left have introduced into the U.S. legal code is the further institutionalization of "political correctness." Any one penalized under such statutes is, by my definition, a political prisoner. It is only a matter of time before the list of political crimes is expanded. This assault on American liberty may yet be the worst evil brought upon us by the Jewish Left; it provides the forces of oppression with a tool of the most powerful destructive force. Legislation of this sort is alien to anything in the U.S. Constitution. Its roots go back to certain European legal codes which gave the aristocracy privileges and immunities in law and custom.

Related to this, the Jewish Left have given us the legal concept of a "protected class." What this means, in effect, is that some are "more equal than others." A member of a "protected class" has greater range of privileges, and is more immune to punishment for criminal acts, than someone less "equal." The whole concept of "protected class" was a payoff by the Jewish Left to its clientela, the Black masses whose votes are necessary on the first Tuesday of November.

In this chapter we have discussed the idea of the Holocaust, but mentioned individuals only secondarily. The next chapter will deal with three individuals and show how their influence conditioned the way we contemporary Americans think of ourselves and the world around us.

1 www.ukrainianmuseum.org sv "Holodomor."

2 Robert Conquest, *The Harvest of Sorrow* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 3, 245, 253.

3 www.faminegenocide.com/resources/resolution356.html

4 Robert Conquest, 129.

5 www.pulitzer.org

6 Ibid.

7 Robert Conquest, 316–318.

8 Flora Lewis, *Red Pawn* (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1965), 257.

9 Ben Hecht, *Perfidy* (New York: Julian Messner, Inc., 1961), 149.

10 Ibid., 149.

11 Ibid., 189.

12 Ibid., 190.

13 Ibid., 190.

CHAPTER 38

THE WRECKING CREW

I can tell you, Sirs, what I would not have; tho I cannot what I would.

—Oliver Crom-well

In this chapter I will review the work of three men who will serve as symbols for the types of evil under study. For me this is a matter of convenience, in which a representative sample must serve in place of the whole. It is not possible to write an exhaustive study on treachery within the scope of a survey text.

I. The Historian: Howard Zinn

What happens when what happened is falsified? Is Truth lost forever? Some would have it so. Some newspapers print all the truth that fits, to paraphrase the New York Times. To address the question of what is taught as history, and who teaches history in our secondary schools and universities, I present the case of Howard Zinn. This man is a product of the New York Jewish Left tradition. In the middle of the twentieth century, New York Jews who were members of Communist and Socialist groups raised their children to these beliefs as normal people would raise children to mainstream religion. This is possible, because, as I have pointed out, Marxism is a religion. The children would go to “progressive” schools (such as the Little Red School House); or, if that could not be arranged, at least to Socialist or Communist summer camps (such as Camp Kinderland). These children were referred to as “red-diaper babies.” And so they were. Howard Zinn is of this tradition.

He wrote a textbook of American history entitled *A People’s History of the United States*. Knowing his Marxist orientation will inure us against a sense of surprise when reading his vile screed, but it cannot protect us against a sense of outrage. One of his first attempts at distortion is to cite the idyllic view of Native American Indians provided by the Spanish priest, Bartolomé de Las Casas:

Marriage laws are non-existent: men and women alike choose their mates and leave them as they please, without offense, jealousy or anger. They multiply in great abundance; pregnant women work to the last minute and give birth almost painlessly; up to the next day, they bathe in the river and are as clean and healthy as before giving birth. If they tire of their men, they give themselves abortions with herbs that force stillbirths, covering their shameful parts with leaves or cotton cloth; although on the whole, Indian men and women look upon total nakedness with as much casualness as we look upon a man’s head or at his clothes.¹

Zinn then cites Las Casas to the effect that the Indians have no religion, or at least no temples. How we may be certain that this singular observation of las Casas is accurate remains unknown, but Zinn takes it literally, because it is “news that fits.”

He continues to cite Las Casas regarding the Indians’ communal lifestyles:

[They live in] large bell-shaped buildings, housing up to 600 people at one time...made of very strong wood and roofed with palm leaves...They prize bird feathers of various colors, beads made of fishbones, and green and white stones with which they adorn their ears and lips, but they put no value on gold and other precious things. They lack all manner of commerce, neither buying nor selling, and rely exclusively on their natural

environment for maintenance. They are extremely generous with their possessions and by the same token covet the possessions of their friends and expect the same degree of liberality.²

These descriptions of Indian life appear to owe something to Biblical accounts of the Garden of Eden, or to wishful thinking. While it is possible that they are accurate, it is doubtful. However, as before, they fit the mold of the noble savage and portray Indians as having a communistic, utopian existence. Thus they serve as a template of what life could be like if evil white men had not corrupted society.

As a counterpoint to Zinn's selective imagery, I present below a citation from a scholarly source. A few hundred miles west of Zinn's sylvan paradise, the following event was occurring:

This Jaina figurine, a living nightmare of torture, opens his mouth in a great howl of pain. His face is swollen and bloodied, and his scalp hangs down from his head, still attached to the nape of the neck. Evidence for this degree of torture among the Maya is not unknown. It appears, for example, that captives on the bench entablature in the Bonampak paintings have had their hands and fingers mangled out of joint. Although the hands and feet of this figure have been reattached, they too, appear to have been twisted out of joint. Like many captives, this figure wears ragged strips of cloth for garments; tied over them at the lower back are pieces of firewood. Even though he is about to be set on fire, this captive will feel little pain, for he has already been killed through disembowelment.³

The event above is indicative of the horrible barbarity of the Mayan and Aztec cultures, an inconvenient truth for Professor Zinn. In fact, the opening sentence in the above source (*The Blood of Kings: Dynasty and Ritual in Maya Art*) reads as follows: "Blood was the mortar of ancient Maya life." But it was not only the Mesoamericans who were brutal. Prof. George Hunt, in his book *The Wars of the Iroquois*, shows the Iroquois to be no less brutal than the worst of the Europeans.⁴ As for the Southwest, a peer-reviewed journal, *Current Anthropology*, shows evidence in the form of skeletal remains that abuse of women and girls was widespread prior to the arrival of the white man.⁵

All of the above evidence debunking the myth of the "noble savage" is so plentiful that only a hack historian or a scoundrel could ignore it. The historical records of these events imply that the only thing that prevented even worse internecine atrocities were technological limitations. The Indians were not as savage as the Europeans only because the Indians lacked the necessary weaponry.

The claims of various Indians today to represent the generic "native American" is spurious, because so many tribes were exterminated by fellow Indians. Some, if not all, of the surviving tribes had to have engaged in genocide, simply on the basis that they had survived as tribal entities long enough to be recorded in the books of the white man.

Next we go to the Revolutionary War, which is viewed through the mechanistic prism of class warfare by Zinn. Since Zinn can view reality in only one way, this is no surprise. What is disturbing is that this intellectually lazy way of thinking is generic to the academy today. Intellectual diversity is nonexistent in today's academy. Regarding the personalities of the Revolutionary period, Zinn fails to remark on the extraordinary

personality of George Washington. This man could have become an autocrat, but chose not to. Maybe Zinn is afraid mention of George Washington would lead to a comparison to Lenin or Stalin. These Russians were (are?) the heroes of Judeofascists such as Zinn, something these Jews are reluctant to admit publicly. The statesmen who drew up the U.S. Constitution created the greatest instrument for self-government in the history of the world, not in the least because it includes mechanisms for self-correction. Which of Zinn's workers' paradises has produced anything close to the U.S. Constitution? Russia? China? North Korea? Cuba? Anyone who can flee from these paradises does so, even at risk of death. These are the sorts of governments the Judeofascists have planned for us.

Next we go to slavery and race relations. In fact, this is the bulk of his entire text, which is nothing more than an indictment of white racism. According to Zinn, every other aspect of U.S. history is a minor aside. He is blind to the ability of our form of government to evolve and solve intestine problems. He is so enamored with Communism that he views any other way of life as aberrant.

Subsequently, he discusses the status of the Irish.⁶ After reading the ordeals they underwent, both in passage, and upon arrival on these shores, one would wonder why anyone immigrates under such conditions. But come they did, by the millions. The grandson of one of these immigrants became the thirty-fifth president of the United States. Could it be that the U. S. offered social mobility? Could it be that the class structure was permeable and open to achievement? Could it be that Marxism is wrong? Impossible! No true believer would sacrifice theory to fact; and Zinn is nothing if not a true believer.

As far as settling the West and the availability of free or cheap land, that was an illusion. Zinn approvingly quotes Hamlin Garland: "Free land is gone. The last acre of available farmland has now passed into private or corporate hands." He continues to quote Garland, citing failed farmers' woes.⁷ Certainly, it is true that there were failed farmers, but most did well. If Zinn's analysis held, the West would never have been settled. But Zinn, from his Marxist perspective, tells us how things should have been. Approvingly, he quotes Hamlin Garland again:

I see a time when the farmer will not need to live in a cabin on a lonely farm. I see the farmers coming together in groups. I see them with time to read, and time to visit with their fellows. I see them enjoying lectures in beautiful halls, erected in every village. I see them gather together like the Saxons of old upon the green at evening to sing and dance. I see cities rising near them with schools, churches, and concert halls and theaters. I see...happy men and women who will go singing to their pleasant tasks upon their fruitful farms.⁸

This idealized commune can exist only in the mind of a liberal intellectual, divorced from the real world. Farmers prefer tractor pulls to violin concertos; they do not set up lecture halls in villages. Zinn does not understand farmers, and if he did, would agree with Marx concerning "the idiocy of rural life." Like Marx, Zinn is an upper middle-class urban Jewish intellectual. Like Marx, his lack of common sense is made up for by a surfeit of arrogance.

Zinn's hack work goes on ad nauseam for 662 pages. Since I am not intending to do a point by point refutation of Zinn's work, I will limit myself to one other observation, that

of the McCarthy Era. Zinn states that the prosecution of the Communist Party was unjust. He follows the “party line” that they were just discussion groups, and merely distributors of Marxist-Leninist tracts, and were no real danger.⁹ In fact, as demonstrated in the Venona documents, the CPUSA was actively engaged in espionage for the Soviet Union.¹⁰ It is almost certain that Zinn, a Judeofascist living in New York at that time, personally knew some of the Soviet spies. We now leave Zinn to go on to someone, who, if possible, is more disgusting.

The Berserker: William Kunstler

When Kunstler wins, everybody loses.

Probably there is no member of the Jewish Left more obnoxious than the attorney William Kunstler. As a young man growing up in New York City, he had all the advantages this country could ever give an immigrant family. His father was a doctor, and the family lived in a nine-room apartment on Central Park West.¹¹ Kunstler got his BA at Yale, and his law degree at Columbia. As in the case of the Zinn family, had the Kunstlers remained in Europe, they would have been turned into bars of soap. To that extent, they would have been useful to humanity. Instead, they repaid the country that saved them by crapping on its doorstep. Kunstler used the law as a weapon against society. He seemed to be motivated by the urge to destroy. We all know that to destroy is fun and easy, to build is difficult and frustrating. He would support anyone who was engaged in antisocial behavior as a way of weakening the social fabric. Regarding the law, he said:

[The law]...is nothing other than a method of control created by a socioeconomic system determined, at all costs, to perpetuate itself by all possible means necessary, for as long as possible. Clarence Darrow put it even more expansively, fifty-eight years ago, when he said that “There is no such thing as justice—in or out of the court.”¹²

His berserker mentality is further demonstrated by his own explanation of his evolution into a radical:

The sixties was my time of transformation. During this period and into the 1970's, I changed from a liberal into a radical and tried to “be here now,” in the words of sixties cultural icon Richard Alpert. Life was to be lived fully, in the present, because the past was over and the future was not yet here. Nothing lost its immediacy for me then, nor does it today. Because of the wrenching and overwhelming effect of the sixties, I still live very much in the moment, racing from case to case, from cause to cause, not worrying or reflecting about what happened yesterday or what might happen tomorrow.¹³

He is just like a bull in a china shop, carelessly and wantonly destroying. Let us take a look at some of his cases/causes. In 1966, he attempted to disrupt the House Un-American Activities Committee's investigation into Communist influences in the antiwar movement. ¹⁴

I was at that time part of the antiwar movement, and worked with members of the Communist Party to subvert the antiwar movement into a pro-Communist front group. The antiwar movement was infiltrated with Communists and fellow-travelers. I was one and could name dozens of others. The antiwar movement was for us a cause to be exploited, regardless of its inherent rightness or wrongness.¹⁵

Because the “Black Power” leaders such as H. Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael were violent and violently anti-American, Kunstler represented them in court on multiple occasions. For similar reasons, he represented Abbie Hoffman, who hated America:

Abbie described himself as a ‘child of America.’ Despite his sophisticated political savvy, underneath the veneer of a man who was so anti-establishment [my emphasis] that he named one of his sons “Amerika” [sic].¹⁶

I think the term antiestablishment is a code word for “anti-American” just as “progressive” is a code word for “Communist.” Fortunately for society, Abbie Hoffman committed suicide in 1989.

In an act of mob violence, prisoners in Attica Correctional Facility in New York took guards hostage. Kunstler represented the prisoners. Kunstler describes one of the inmates: “Sam was a young revolutionary who had been convicted of firebombing a New York bank.” He liked inmates of this type, and he also liked Black Muslims. Both groups hate America, thus qualifying for his “most favored nations” status. He felt privileged to represent them in court. He was especially pleased to represent Blacks who have killed police officers, or anyone who is white. “Any time a black person is charged with a crime against a white law enforcement officer, I consider it political.”¹⁷ Then what could have been a better case than that of Joanne Chesimard (now Assata Shakur)? She was accused of killing a white police officer. Despite Kunstler’s best efforts, she was convicted of murder. Eventually, she escaped from prison, and made her way to the New Jerusalem of the Jewish Left (Havana).¹⁸

A case similar to the last above was that of Kathy Boudin. She was convicted in the case of the murder of two police officers and one guard during the attempted robbery of a Brink’s truck in 1981. (Those were the days before George Soros; therefore the Left had to gain money “by any means necessary.”) This case is interesting because it weaves together the lives of three Judeofascists who were licensed to pervert law. Kathy Boudin was the daughter of Leonard Boudin, an Old Left Commie lawyer.

Some weeks before the trial, the media asked Kunstler his opinion of the case, and he played down the political aspects of the case, thinking that would be in the best interests of his potential clients. It was only after the media statement that Kunstler actually met the defendants. The defendants were furious with his action; they wanted it to be a political case:

I made my statement to the press because I thought I was doing the right thing for the defendants. But when I met with them later in prison, they were furious. To them, the Brinks robbery was a revolutionary act because it was the first time since the abolitionist John Brown attacked the federal arsenal at Harpers Ferry, Virginia, that white and blacks had physically fought together on the same side as an integrated unit.¹⁹

Enter the third Old Left Commie lawyer: Leonard Weinglass. Probably because of Kunstler’s admitted blunder (for which he expressed regret), Papa Boudin hired Weinglass to represent his daughter.

The trial must have been like old home week for the New York Communist Party.

Dear Reader, do not despair; only two more cases from the career of this wretched man...Stop, take a good stiff drink, or an aspirin, and plow on.

In 1993, Colin Ferguson, a Jamaican Black, opened fire with a semi-automatic pistol on a commuter train in New York, killing six people in cold blood. This was the sort of case Kunstler loved; he invented a new defense: Black rage. That is to say, hatred against whites is a legitimate defense if one is Black. We should stop to consider the ramifications of this case on Black society. It exacerbates racial tension, and treats Blacks as having a childlike mentality. It plays to the mob as a part of the “bread and circuses” mentality so needed by the Jewish Left in order to make certain the Blacks continue to fulfill their role as the shaft of the Jewish spear. Certainly this mentality of blaming others impedes Black efforts at achievement. But that is just fine. If Blacks were to become self-reliant, they would be rendered unfit to serve their assigned purposes. A little havoc can go a little way as a solvent to disrupt social cohesion, but a lot of havoc can go a long way. “You can’t make an omelet without breaking eggs” (Stalin).

The final episode to relate is that of the World Trade Center bombing of 1993. Kunstler defended the leaders in the plotting and execution of this terrorist act. As an act of mass terrorism, the attempted physical destruction of a part of the capitalist system must have given him the greatest pleasure of his entire career. It would have served to actualize his infantile need for destruction on a scale that just might have begun to satisfy his warped psyche. Certainly, the destruction of the World Trade Center in 2001 would have gladdened his heart, which fortunately for us, ceased to beat in 1995.

Our Soros / Our Sorrow

During the nineteenth century, the German historian Heinrich von Treitschke stated, “Die Juden sind Unser Unglueck” (The Jews are our misfortune). If George Soros is successful in his endeavors, the statement will apply to the United States. George Soros was born Gyorgy Schwartz in Hungary on August 12, 1930.²⁰ His father was an expert in Esperanto, a concocted language that was supposed to become the universal world language. The son was also competent in Esperanto. In 1936, the father changed the family name to “Soros,” which means “to soar” in Esperanto.²¹ This episode of name and language selection in the Soros household shows its transnational character. They were in Hungary, but not of Hungary. The same is true of Soros in the United States. He has no real nationality and desires none. He refers to himself as a “stateless statesman.”²² He does not know the feeling of pride and happiness that I feel when I see our flag. He doesn’t even like America; to him, America is the enemy. He lives in the environs of New York City, which may be part of the United States, but is not America. To him, the United States serves as the most useful instrument with which to shape the world. Recall Archimedes: “Give me a lever and I will move the world.” The day Soros became a naturalized citizen should be proclaimed a national day of mourning.

He grew up in dual anti-Semitism: in his home and in Hungary. “I grew up in a Jewish, anti-Semite, home.”²³ The family attitude was a reflection of the widespread anti-Semitism prevalent in Hungary at that time. Soros, like all Judeofascists, is an anti-Semitic Jew. His take on being a persecuted Jew is that Jews react to persecution in predictable ways:

When you look at the ways Jews react to persecution, you’ll find that they tend to follow one of two main escape routes. Either they transcend their problem by turning to something universal [sic] or they identify with their oppressors and try to become like

them. I came from an assimilationist family and I have chosen the first route. The other alternative is Zionism, the founding of a nation where Jews are in the majority.²⁴

This is approximately correct. Included in the first alternative there is the path of becoming Joseph to Pharaoh. In the next chapter, we will see how this plays out.

Having survived the Holocaust could not have failed to shape his life, although to what extent his personality structure predated the Holocaust can never be determined. He was a boy of fourteen at the time. He speaks very little about it, and what he does say is very inconsistent. Prior to quoting him regarding his own experiences, it is vital to note the role Jewish collaborators played by helping the Nazis. The Jewish population of Hungary could never have been exterminated without the help of Jewish collaborators.

Now we will examine Soros in his own words, as told to Steve Kroft on 60 Minutes (CBS) on December 20, 1998.²⁵ The interview begins against a backdrop of films of Hungarian Jews boarding trains to death camps.

KROFT: You're a Hungarian Jew—

SOROS: Mm-hmm.

(Vintage footage of people getting on train)

KROFT: —who escaped the Holocaust—

SOROS: Mm-hmm.

KROFT: —by—by posing as a Christian.

SOROS: Right.

(Vintage footage of women helping each other get on train; train door closing with people in boxcar)

KROFT: And you watched lots of people get shipped off to death camps.

SOROS: Right. I was fourteen years old. And I would say that that's when my character was made.

KROFT: In what way?

SOROS: That one should think ahead. One should understand and—and anticipate events and when—when one is threatened. It was a tremendous threat of evil. I mean, it was a— a very personal experience of evil.

KROFT: My understanding is that you went out with this protector of yours who swore that you were his adopted godson.

KROFT: Yes. Yes.

KROFT: Went out, in fact, and helped in the confiscation of property from the Jews.

SOROS: Yes. That's right. Yes.

KROFT: I mean, that's—that sounds like an experience that would send lots of people to the psychiatric couch for many, many, years. Was it difficult?

SOROS: Not—not at all. Maybe as a child you don't—you don't see the connection. But it was—it created no—no problem at all.

KROFT: No feeling of guilt?

SOROS: No.

KROFT: For example that, "I'm Jewish and here I am, watching these people go. I could just as easily be there. I should be there." None of that?

SOROS: Well, of course I could be on the other side, or I could be the one from whom the thing is being taken away. But there was no sense that I shouldn't be there, because that was—well, actually, in a funny way, it was just like the markets—that if I weren't there—of course I wasn't doing it, but somebody else would—would—would be taking it away anyhow. And it was the—whether I was only a spectator, the property was being taken away. So the—I had no role in taking away that property. So I had no sense of guilt.

Returning our attention to the general case, we must ask: What specific function did collaborators play?

The Jews of the ghetto would not have trusted the Nazi or Hungarian rulers. But they had trust in their Jewish leaders. Eichmann and others used this known fact as part of their calculated plan to mislead Jews. They were able to deport Jews to their extermination by the help of Jewish leaders.²⁶

These collaborators worked through the Jewish Council, an organization set up by Eichmann to get the Jews to operate the engine of their own death. It was this Council with which Soros collaborated:

George, meanwhile, began working as a courier for the Jewish Council, which had quickly been established by Eichmann. As in other cities where the Nazis had set up such organizations, the council was intended as a first step leading to the identification and registration of Jews, which would be followed by herding them into ghettos and ultimately by their deportation to forced labor and death.²⁷

For a normal person, to have collaborated with the Nazis would have led to a postwar life of guilt. By Soros' own admission, he felt none of that. But the matter gets worse. Not only did he feel no remorse, he felt it was "a great thrill":

For the next three and a half hours, Soros spoke about his Jewishness, about his childhood experiences, and especially about hiding from the Nazis during World War II. "It was one of the most exciting things in my life," he told Landa. "Hiding like that was like playing cops and robbers. It was a great thrill."²⁸

There is something wrong, very wrong, with a man who participated as a Nazi collaborator, and not only had no guilt, but also found that the period provided him with a "great thrill." When caught by Kroft's unexpected questioning, Soros offered the same excuse used by so many Nazi war criminals: "if I wasn't doing it...somebody else would."

We can note a behavioral trait that will be consistent with the above. This trait is a sense of omnipotence. Having survived the Holocaust, combined with having made so much money, can only have reinforced any such preexisting trait. His self-perception is based on reality. Anyone who could have achieved either one of these goals is an extraordinary person. To have achieved both marks him as a man of almost unprecedented personal power. In order to be so successful, he must be capable of gauging reality far beyond the scope of almost anyone alive. Whatever else we may say about him, we must credit him with this power. He is aware of this power:

If the truth be known, I carried some of rather potent messianic fantasies with me from childhood, which I felt I had to control, otherwise they might get me into trouble...

It is a sort of disease when you consider yourself some kind of god, the creator of everything, but I feel comfortable about it now since I began to act it out...

A journalist once suggested to Soros that he should be appointed pope. "Why?" he asked. "I'm the pope's boss now."²⁹

Among the various powers he has is the power to deceive. Anyone reading his autobiography, *Soros on Soros*, is told again and again that the main premise of his philosophy is that human intellect is inherently imperfect, and that accordingly, we need to have a social and political system that is open to criticism.³⁰ He defines open societies as ones which allow such criticism. Closed societies, on the other hand, do not permit such self-corrective criticism. A naïve person reading his autobiography would presume him to be a reasonable man, one who is trying to increase the degree of human freedom. However, this is all deceit. What the master says he means, and what he actually means, are as different as night and day. We will see what sort of society he proposes for us in the next chapter.

We need to look at one additional aspect of Soros before proceeding to the next chapter. No matter how gifted, the behavior of all human beings conforms to certain categories. We can safely assume, therefore, that although Soros may be unique in the degree to which he possesses certain traits, that the particular constellation of traits that comprise his personality is not unique to him. Below are listed the Diagnostic & Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders IV (DSM IV) traits for the Sociopath.

Profile of the Sociopath

This Web site summarizes some of the common features of descriptions of the behavior of sociopaths. I have boldfaced those characteristics that I think fit Soros.

Glibness and Superficial Charm

Manipulative and Cunning

They never recognize the rights of others and see their self-serving behaviors as permissible. They appear to be charming, yet are covertly hostile and domineering, seeing their victim as merely an instrument to be used. They may dominate and humiliate their victims.

Grandiose Sense of Self

Feels entitled to certain things as “their right.”

Pathological Lying

Has no problem lying coolly and easily and it is almost impossible for them to be truthful on a consistent basis. Can create, and get caught up in, a complex belief about their own powers and abilities. Extremely convincing and even able to pass lie detector tests.

Lack of Remorse, Shame or Guilt

A deep seated rage, which is split off and repressed, is at their core. Does not see others around them as people, but only as targets and opportunities. Instead of friends, they have victims and accomplices who end up as victims. The end always justifies the means and they let nothing stand in their way.

Shallow Emotions

When they show what seems to be warmth, joy, love and compassion it is more feigned than experienced and serves an ulterior motive. Outraged by insignificant matters, yet remaining unmoved and cold by what would upset a normal person. Since they are not genuine, neither are their promises.

Incapacity for Love

Need for Stimulation

Living on the edge. Verbal outbursts and physical punishments are normal. Promiscuity and gambling are common.

Callousness / Lack of Empathy

Unable to empathize with the pain of their victims, having only contempt for others' feelings of distress and readily taking advantage of them.

Poor Behavioral Controls / Impulsive Nature

Rage and abuse, alternating with small expressions of love and approval produce an addictive cycle for abuser and abused, as well as creating hopelessness in the victim. Believe they are all-powerful, all-knowing, entitled to every wish, no sense of personal boundaries, no concern for their impact on others.

Early Behavior Problems / Juvenile Delinquency

Usually has a history of behavioral and academic difficulties, yet “gets by” by conning others. Problems in making and keeping friends; aberrant behaviors such as cruelty to people or animals, stealing, etc.

Irresponsibility/Unreliability

Not concerned about wrecking others' lives and dreams. Oblivious or indifferent to the devastation they cause. Does not accept blame themselves, but blames others, even for acts they obviously committed.

Promiscuous Sexual Behavior / Infidelity

Promiscuity, child sexual abuse, rape and sexual acting out of all sorts.

Lack of Realistic Life Plan / Parasitic Lifestyle

Tends to move around a lot or makes all-encompassing promises for the future, poor work ethic but exploits others effectively.

Criminal or Entrepreneurial Versatility

Changes their image as needed to avoid prosecution. Changes life story readily.

Other Related Qualities:

Contemptuous of those who seek to understand them

Does not perceive that anything is wrong with them

Authoritarian

Secretive

Paranoid

Only rarely in difficulty with the law, but seeks out situations where their tyrannical behavior will be tolerated, condoned, or admired

Conventional appearance

Goal of enslavement of their victim(s)

Exercises despotic control over every aspect of the victim's life

Has an emotional need to justify their crimes and therefore needs their victim's affirmation (respect, gratitude and love)

Ultimate goal is the creation of a willing victim

Incapable of real human attachment to another

Unable to feel remorse or guilt

Extreme narcissism and grandiose

May state readily that their goal is to rule the world

(The above traits are based on the psychopathy checklists of H. Cleckley and R. Hare.)

NOTE: In the 1830s this disorder was called "moral insanity."

There is also a further discussion in the DSM IV of an even more dangerous personality type, which is an extreme form of the Sociopathic Personality. It is called The Malignant Personality. Below are some of their traits:

Profile of the Malignant Personality

These people are mentally ill and extremely dangerous! The following precautions will help to protect you from the destructive acts of which they are capable.

First, to recognize them, keep the following guidelines in mind:

1. They are habitual liars. They seem incapable of either knowing or telling the truth about anything.
2. They are egotistical to the point of narcissism. They really believe they are set apart from the rest of humanity by some special grace.
3. They scapegoat; they are incapable of either having the insight or willingness to accept responsibility for anything they do. Whatever the problem, it is always someone else's fault.
4. They are remorselessly vindictive when thwarted or exposed.
5. Genuine religious, moral, or other values play no part in their lives. They have no empathy for others and are capable of violence. Under older psychological terminology, they fall into the category of psychopath or sociopath, but unlike the typical psychopath, their behavior is masked by a superficial social façade.

How do we protect ourselves from these people when they have the levers of the power of the state in their hands?

1 Howard Zinn, *A People's History of the United States*, (New York: Harper Collins, 1999), 5.

2 *Ibid.*, 6.

3 Schele, Linda, and Miller, Mary E., *The Blood of Kings: Dynasty and Ritual in Maya Art* (New York: G. Braziller, Inc. and the Kimball Art Museum, Fort Worth, 1986), 228.

4 Hunt, George T., *The Wars of the Iroquois: A Study in Intertribal Relations* (Madison, WI., The University Press), 68, 90, 93.

5 Kohler and Turner, "Raiding for Women in the Pre-Hispanic Northern Pueblo Southwest," *Current Anthropology*, vol. 47, issue 6 (2006).

6 Zinn, 226–227.

7 *Ibid.*, 282.

8 *Ibid.*, 283.

9 Zinn, 435.

- 10 Weinstein and Vassiliev, *The Haunted Wood*, (New York: Random House, 1999), 302–308.
- 11 Zinn, 264.
- 12 William M. Kunstler, *My Life as a Radical Lawyer* (New York: Citadel Press, 1996), 403.
- 13 *Ibid.*, 165.
- 14 *Ibid.*, 177.170-171.
- 15 *Ibid.*, 177.
- 16 *Ibid.*, 197.
- 17 *Ibid.*, 275.
- 18 *Ibid.*, 277.
- 19 *Ibid.*, 278.
- 20 David Horowitz and Richard Poe, *The Shadow Party* (Nashville, TN: Nelson Current, 2006), 78.
- 21 *Ibid.*, 79.
- 22 George Soros, *Soros on Soros* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1995), 244.
- 23 Robert Slater, *Soros, The Unauthorized Biography* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1996), 20.
- 24 George Soros, 240.
- 25 CBS 60 Minutes: Interview Soros and Kroft. Dec. 20, 1998. <http://sweetness-light.com/archive> (accessed Nov. 17, 2007).
- 26 Ben Hecht. *Op cit.*, 178.
- 27 Michael T. Kaufman, *Soros: The Life and Times of a Messianic Billionaire* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002), 32.
- 28 Slater, 219.
- 29 Slater, 15–16.
- 30 Soros, 227.

CHAPTER 39

EVILS COMING TOGETHER: GEORGE AND HILLARY

We have now for a long time, O conscript fathers, lived among these dangers and machinations of conspiracy; but somehow or other, the ripeness of all wickedness, and of this longstanding madness and audacity, has come to a head at the time of my consulship.

—Cicero

In 1956, when George Soros arrived in New York City, he found the fulcrum for his lever. Having arrived, as he states, practically penniless, Soros worked for several brokerage houses as an expert on arbitrage. I will try to define arbitrage. If you own a

dollar, a share of stock, or a bond, and you live in New York, you can look on the trading board of any major brokerage firm and determine how much your piece of paper is worth, on that day, and at that particular hour, denominated in any given currency. However, it may be worth a slight amount less (or more) in London, at that day and that particular hour. An expert in arbitrage may then transfer a given financial instrument from one market to another, in order to make a very small profit. Now, although the profit is very small on one share of stock, or on a single dollar, when you exchange millions (or billions) of such pieces of paper, you can become very rich overnight. In this fashion George Soros became a multibillionaire.

If Soros had remained merely one of the richest men on earth, he would not be of concern to me. As I noted in the previous chapter, he is a sociopath. That also would not be a concern to me. I also noted that his power to understand what is happening around him is developed to an extraordinary degree, to say the least. He could not possibly have been so successful an investor, over time and to the degree that he is, if he were not a master of instantly understanding complex situations. Being a sociopath and a genius are traits that sort independently in the makeup of the personality structure. Under usual circumstances, all of the above would be of no concern to me. But because Soros has decided to marshal his impressive resources for the purpose of destroying my country, he is of concern to me.

Putting aside his seductive and well-written autobiography (Soros on Soros), we must look at his actions. As I stated in the preceding chapter, what the master says and what the master does are two different things. Therefore, to make further reference to his self-proclaimed guiding philosophy will serve only to mislead us.

Soros' first step in deconstructing American society was to start a master foundation. He named it the Open Society Institute. The name could have been chosen by George Orwell, because the function of the Institute, as we shall see, is to impose corporate Socialism on the U.S. One of its directors is Morton Halperin:

Halperin waged open war against the U.S. intelligence services, through the courts and the press, seeking to strip the government of virtually any power to investigate, monitor or obstruct subversive elements and their activities. It did not take him long to go to the next logical step and argue for abolishing America's intelligence services altogether. "Using secret intelligence agencies to defend a constitutional republic is akin to the ancient practice of employing leeches to take blood from feverish patients. The intent is therapeutic, but in the long run the cure is more deadly than the disease..."

In a March 1987 article in *The Nation*, Halperin expanded on this theme and...took the position that America was the real villain in the Cold War. He wrote, "Secrecy does not serve national security. Covert operations are incompatible with constitutional government and should be abolished." This was a call for unilateral disarming of our intelligence services to match the disarmament of our military, which has long been a staple of the radical agenda.¹

Soros has great skill identifying U.S. citizens who are dedicated enemies of their native land. These are the scum that no other countries would tolerate. Soros employs them. In this class is Aryeh Neier, a high-ranking operative in the Institute:

Another Soros appointee is Aryeh Neier, who is president of the Open Society Institute and the Soros Foundation Network. As director of the socialist League for Industrial Democracy, Neier personally created the radical Students for a Democratic Society, or SDS, in 1959. During the Vietnam War, SDS was the student group most responsible for fanning the flames of unrest on US campuses, and later transformed itself into the terrorist Weather Underground, which declared war on “Amerikkka” and bombed the Pentagon and the Capitol.²

Not all the anti-American home-grown scum is Jewish. Lynne Stewart is a non-Jewish traitor. Long an activist in pro-Communist causes, she is a lawyer who defended the “blind Sheik” Omar Abdel Rahman, one of the plotters of the 1993 World Trade Center Bombing. But she did more than that; she served as a messenger to deliver his messages from his prison cell to his terrorist followers still at large. When arrested, she stated her agenda:

To rid ourselves of the entrenched, voracious type of capitalism that is in this country that perpetuates sexism and racism, I don't think that can come nonviolently...I'm talking about a popular revolution. I'm talking about institutions being changed and that will not be changed without violence.³

There is something else to note regarding Stewart. Ordinarily, she would have no sympathy for Islamic fundamentalism, which is categorically opposed to her feminist ideology. But since Islamic extremists are enemies of the U.S., she supports them insofar as they weaken the U.S. She acts on the premise that the enemy of my enemy is my friend. Cynical utilitarianism.

Who do you think contributed \$20,000.00 to the Lynne Stewart Defense Committee? Why, none other than the Open Society Institute!⁴ When this embarrassing contribution became known, the Institute declined to make further contributions. But that was only to delude the gullible; other Soros-funded entities continued to do so. In fact, Soros seems to be her financial angel: “Soros may have stopped giving direct grants to Lynne Stewart, but...virtually every other organization taking a prominent role in the ‘Free Lynne Stewart’ movement receives financial support from the Open Society Institute.”⁵ In this fashion Soros thanks us for giving him shelter from European tyranny. Savage Ingratitude!

Using the Democratic Process to Subvert the Democratic Process

As brilliant as Soros is, we cannot ignore other giants, upon whose shoulders he stands. Heading the list is Saul Alinsky (1909–1972). He was a Chicago native whose life was devoted to destroying the order in which he lived. He lived well; if his parents had stayed in Europe, he would not have lived so well. Thus it is difficult to understand why he was so impelled to bring Europe here. Alinsky was shrewd and believed in subverting the system from within. He was an equal opportunity schmoozer, sucking up to organized crime as well as to business to get funding:

Alinsky's real power came not from the criminal underworld, however, but from Wall Street—specifically, from the wealthy, “socially-conscious” patricians who funded his activism. A skilled fundraiser, Alinsky managed to smooth-talk some of America's wealthiest philanthropists into underwriting his Industrial Areas Foundation—an

organization dedicated to waging class warfare in America. He prided himself on his ability “to use the strength of the enemy against itself”—a strategy he called “mass jujitsu.” “I feel confident that I could persuade a millionaire on Friday to subsidize a revolution for Saturday out of which he would make a huge profit on Sunday even though he was certain to be executed on Monday,” Alinsky once quipped.⁶

We have seen that the Kennedy family did the same, as did the Clintons.

If you wonder, dear Reader, that there are patricians so naïve, read the annals of the French Revolution. You will encounter numerous self-hating aristocrats. But closer to our time and place, I offer you John Lindsey, the liberal Republican aristocrat who was Mayor of New York in the mid 1960s. He is the poster child for white liberal guilt. He buckled when a welfare mother screamed at him: “It’s my job to have kids, Mr. Mayor, and your job to take care of them.”⁷ If our society dies, it will be with a Lindseyian whimper.

The reason for giving this brief introduction to Alinsky is to point out his ingenuity. He saw that Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society program was giving away money to an alphabet soup of new agencies “to make war on poverty.” Some of these were VISTA, Head Start, Job Corps, and the Community Action Program. Alinsky was shrewd and made certain that the employees of these agencies were radical leftists. This ploy served the dual purpose of getting the taxpayer to fund programs designed to defraud the taxpayer himself, and to destroy the very system that most taxpayers wanted to preserve. The ploy also allowed radicalized suburban intellectuals (usually Jews) the opportunity to radicalize poor urban Blacks. There was no downside for the players in this particular shell game.

There is another shell game the Left uses. Probably it was a leaf taken from organized crime, which used (uses?) union funds for its own enrichment. We are here dealing with labor organizations, particularly the Service Employees International Union (SEIU). With the union movement losing steam in the private sector, the Left is tapping into the public sector, which is growing. Also, a significant proportion of public sector employees are poorly motivated and do not wish to work. They are well protected from disciplinary action by union contracts, and if they happen to have minority status, are practically untouchable. So for someone who wants a paycheck with minimal work requirements, or who has a character disorder, the public sector is a safe place to be.

The president of the SEIU is Andrew Stern, another Jew of whom we may be proud. He is actively engaged in deconstructing the country which has kept him from becoming a bar of soap. The union dues of the SEIU are a “cash cow” to leftist organizations.⁸

So we see that Soros is cunning enough to get other people’s money to support his bastard progeny. He has been successful in capturing tax dollars, foundation money, and union funds.

Hillary Clinton, Queen of the Jews

George Soros is the man who would be Pharaoh. Some men would like to be king, ruler of the secular realm. But that is not enough for Soros. The power of Pharaoh includes both the secular and divine realms. That is the station to which he aspires. But because he

is foreign born and because he is a Jew, Soros cannot fill the role himself. He will have to settle for being the power behind the throne. Enter the Clintons.

If Bill and Hillary had not been able to tap into the resources of the Jewish Left, they would have ended their careers as they began; corrupt co-dictators of a small southern state. Their role model could have been early Huey Long. Propelled by Jewish money and influence, they have been able to realize national ambitions. We will consider Hillary first. Between the two of them, she is the ideologue.

Hillary came of age in Park Ridge, an affluent and conservative suburb of Chicago. It was the era of the late 1950s and early 1960s. The Methodist Church to which she belonged had just obtained a new pastor. Rev. Don Jones had just left seminary and was inspired by the work of German theologians such as Paul Tillich (it seems we are never free of the German influence). He was also knowledgeable about the works of T.S. Eliot, French New Wave cinema, and last but not least, Marxism. We see again the influence of the dead hand of Karl Marx. Marx seems to have a most unshakable grip on the minds of certain intellectuals.⁹ “Rev. Don” was one more who succumbed to Marxism, “the opiate of the intellectuals.” Her exposure to “Rev. Don” marked the beginning of her “conversion” from Methodism to Marxism.

The next step on Hillary’s “conversion” was her undergraduate education at Wellesley College. “My mind exploded when I got to Wellesley,” Hillary recalled several decades later.¹⁰ Hillary was so impressed by this experience that she institutionalized it in a program in Arkansas called the ‘Governor’s School.’ The course work included two sections, one on critical thinking and another on feeling. “Students were told that the unit on critical thinking was designed to take you apart so that the feelings unit could put you back together.”¹¹ What this amounted to was to destroy any conventional values the student may have had, in order to replace them with ‘progressive’ values.¹² It is easy for college-educated adult ideologues to bully teenagers.

Which views are Hillary “taking apart”? The institutions that Hillary seeks to destroy are those that “enslave” individuals. Examples are “along with the family, past and present examples of such...include marriage, slavery and the Indian reservation system.”¹³ She is saying, in essence, “that all dependency relationships are bad, except for dependence of the individual on the state.”¹⁴ We should be grateful; she is generously willing to pass on the benefits of a Wellesley education to those of us unfortunate enough to have missed out. Another one of the results of her “conversion” was the belief that childcare should be turned over to government, and that parents must surrender all rights to transmit their values to their own children.¹⁵

Children play a great role in Hillary’s life... as symbols. Hillary is keenly aware that she has a far better chance of putting the government in charge of as much of our lives as possible if she can frame the power grab as something in the interest of children. Children become her means to an end. We cannot know, nor does it matter, what she really thinks of children. Children, like Blacks, because they are a means to an end, would have to be invented if they did not already exist. Her greatest ally in this endeavor is Marion Wright Edelman. If any one person could be found to unite the forces of the Left into one person, it would be she. Marion herself is Black, and came of age during Lyndon Johnson’s failed attempt to drown poverty in tax dollars. She married Peter Edelman, a member of

the Jewish Left. They created an organization that eventually became known as The Children's Defense Fund, which was financed by the Carnegie Corporation as well as the federal government.¹⁶ If there is some sort of Connivance Olympics, the bronze would go to Edelman. (George and Hillary would take gold and silver.)

One of the organizations to which our tax money goes is entitled the Legal Services Corporation. In theory, it is supposed to be an engine to ensure that legal services are provided to the poor. In reality, it is an agency which has been highjacked by the Left. It is one more of many agencies that use tax dollars to destroy the institutions that most taxpayers cherish. It is a poison in the body politic, paid for by the body politic. What does this organization do? In 1978, Hillary chaired the organization. During a two-day retreat, its board affirmed its goal of "empowering the poor":

The LSC's idea of empowerment was to use legal action to expand the welfare rolls and get as many people as possible on food stamps and Social Security Disability...to bring about a redistribution of income. This goal would be expressed by Gary Bellow, executive director of the legal Services Institute...by "increasing people's sense of grievance and entitlement."¹⁷

By the late 1970's, LSC training programs were teaching harassment techniques, such as nailing a dead rat to an opponent's front door...Another approved tactic, often used against small business owners, was filing many small harassment suits in order to break the opponent financially...Literature handed out...explained that plant closings presented an "exciting opportunity" to move toward "rebuilding a broad-based American socialist movement."¹⁸

Clearly going outside the law, the LSC campaigned against a tax-reduction initiative in California (Prop Nine) and against Ronald Reagan. When the scope of their illegal activities was finally tackled by the GAO, it was found that when the original charter for the LSC was written by Alan Housman, it was phrased in such a way as to immunize the law-breakers from any penalty. However, the Justice Department did state that "the activities of the LSC and many of the people associated with it are uniquely reprehensible and beyond the scope of the LSC's original mission."¹⁹

Not surprisingly, many staff positions on the LSC went to attorneys from the National Lawyers' Guild, a Communist-front organization. Funds to such Communist lawyers went to support causes such as the Palestine Liberation Organization, and the Baader-Meinhoff Gang (Communist terrorists) in Germany.

To find an institution like this without involvement of the Jewish Left would be as rare as finding Bill Clinton sleeping alone. Through this organization Hillary met Frederick A.O. Schwarz, a wealthy New York Jew of great local political clout. Later she would meet Mickey Kantor, another wealthy Jew who would be of service to her and Bill in his role of Secretary of Commerce during the Clinton administration.

Although most of the Jews that Hillary met and used served either as cash cows or political facilitators, at least two served as ideological mentors. One was Michael Lerner. Lerner founded a magazine called Tikkun. "It puts forth an amalgam of neo-Marxism, Judaism and New Ageism that Lerner calls 'the politics of meaning.'"²⁰ I have read a few of his articles, and I have no idea how the title "politics of meaning" has any

connection with the infantile utopian Socialism he advocates. I think he found the words catchy and used them for that reason alone.

The other Jew in question is Robert Reich. He is a gnomelike academic whom the Clintons made Secretary of Labor. He did all in his power to channel goods and services away from those who produce, toward those who do not wish to produce, but still wish to consume. He is a Socialist.

An obsession with money has become a major preoccupation for both Clintons. Hillary was active in the minor leagues when, in 1980, she “invested” about \$1,000 in cattle futures and “made” a profit of \$99,540.21 This was clearly a bribe for either services rendered, or to be rendered, in her role as wife of the governor of a small, corrupt southern state. Subsequent to that, she and Bill got into the big leagues: international money laundering. Interested readers can consult stories about James Riady, John Huang, and the role of Ron Brown in relation to the Clintons.

I think one of the best comparisons I can make regarding the Clintons is to a pair of tag-team wrestlers. When Bill is in office and has to remain sort of clean, Hillary does the dirty work, such as the deferred \$100,000 bride. Then Bill can say he had nothing to do with it. On the other hand, when Hillary is vulnerable, Bill can do the dirty work. This occurred during her first run for the New York Senate seat vacated by Moynihan. Bill was President at that time. He issued a presidential pardon to sixteen convicted Puerto Rican terrorists, thus ensuring Hillary the Hispanic vote. The media did note an outcry, but they soft-pedaled it, and the issue soon died. If the pardon had been made by a Republican president, we would still be hearing about it today. When Gerald Ford pardoned Nixon, it cost him the White House. When Bill pardoned the sixteen terrorists, he bought a Senate seat for his tag-teammate.

The early history of Hillary leads me to conclude that it was she, rather than Bill, who engineered the Jewish Left–Clinton connection. Her fingerprints are all over such Clinton appointees as Robert Reich, Madeleine Albright, and Ruth Bader-Ginsburg. If this is the case, it is her major contribution to the partnership.

We cannot say for certain when the Soros-Clinton connection was made, but we can say it was firm by 1995. “I like to influence policy. I was not able to get to George Bush [Senior]. But now I think I have succeeded with my influence...I do now have great access in [the Clinton] administration. There is no question about this. We actually work together as a team” (Soros to Charlie Rose on PBS).²²

Now we, too, can account for the whole team.

We need to step back and look at what we have uncovered. The Jewish Left has linked itself to Pharaoh. If we use Soros as a surrogate for the Jewish Left, we simplify matters for purposes of discussion.

Soros makes the classic mistake of failing to understand the uniqueness of the United States. The U.S. is not the USSR. It is not necessary to destroy the Republic for the Jew to feel safe. The tragedy is that if Soros succeeds in remaking the U.S. according to his Marxist template, he will have helped to create a tyrannical state. Despite his power and intellect, he (or his successors) will eventually lose control of that state, and there will

come to power “a Pharaoh who does not know Joseph.” The same ancient and bloody cycle will repeat, needlessly.

Soros does not need Bill and Hillary as such. He only needs what they represent. In fact, both could easily be replaced by one or another non-Jewish figurehead. John Kerry, Barack Obama, or John Edwards would do as well. The pink orchestra could be given new sheet music by fax, and tomorrow sing the praises of any candidate.

Soros and the Jewish Left think that they can avoid this outcome by creating a supranational state under the UN. This will not happen. The closest they will come will be to create a supranational UN-sponsored Mafia. The lawlessness of individual tyrannies will be enhanced, not checked, by a supranational power. A good example is the fraud around the Oil for Food program involving Iraq. In terms of dollar amounts this may be the greatest fraud ever; curiously, the media has ignored it. Are you surprised?

We have now come full circle back to Joseph and Pharaoh. What is most distressing is the failure of the Jewish community to learn from 4,000 years of past experience. Why should a ploy that did not work in Egypt, that did not work in Persia, that did not work in Rome, that did not work in Germany; a ploy that failed in Poland, Russia, and Lithuania... Why should such a ploy work in the U.S.? Repeating again and again what does not work...is this not a form of Insanity?

And Tragedy...Do we not see here a fatal blindness to the uniqueness of American experience?

And Arrogance...Do we not see here a fatal conceit on the part of a few that they alone have the wisdom to set the agenda for all?

And Indifference...Do we not see here a blithe indifference to the greatest slaughter of human beings since the Mongol invasions of the thirteenth century; a slaughter that is the direct consequence of a failed ideology?

This is the last chapter of the narrative. I have related the past and brought us up to present time. The future is unknown, even to George Soros. If I can have contributed, even to the smallest degree, of preventing one more bloody reprise, this work has served its purpose.

1 Horowitz and Poe, *The Shadow Party*, 24-25.

2 *Ibid.*, 25.

3 *Ibid.*, 33.

4 *Ibid.*, 28.

5 *Ibid.*, 33.

6 *Ibid.*, 58.

7 *Ibid.*, 112.

8 *Ibid.*, 125.

9 Joyce Milton, *The First Partner: Hillary Clinton* (New York: William Morrow and Co., 1999), 21.

- 10 Ibid., 25.
- 11 Ibid., 160.
- 12 Ibid., 160.
- 13 Ibid., 159.
- 14 Ibid., 60.
- 15 Ibid., 146–150.
- 16 Ibid., 42–46.
- 17 Ibid., 127.
- 18 Ibid., 130.
- 19 Ibid., 135.
- 20 Ibid., 282.
- 21 Ibid., 106–107.
- 22 Horowitz and Poe, Op cit. 91.

Conclusion

General

If liberty dies in the US, it will be neither violent nor sudden. It will be death by a thousand cuts. There will be no great deciding battle as at Yorktown or Gettysburg. Nor yet will it be like the battle at Thermopylae, in which brave men could die fighting for freedom, rather than agree to live under tyranny. It is a great privilege to prepare for battle the night before, knowing that tomorrow you will either live free or die. Tragically, it is not a privilege we shall enjoy, unless we fight back now. In our case, tyranny is creeping up on us on little cats' paws, inch by inch. There is little perceptible difference from day to day, as the border between subject and citizen is intentionally blurred.

We will be conditioned to accept "improvements" in our lives. Today it may be the outlawing of smoking in public; tomorrow the outlawing of "hate speech." Next week it may be a special tax on ammunition; the next week an exaggerated concern for the handicapped. The pill is coated with sugar. But make no mistake: the Left have no real concern for our health, welfare or safety; they are slowly accustoming us to accept obedience to rules from "experts" for our own good. I repeat, it is not the specific regulation that concerns the Left; any regulation will do. The goal is to accustom us to the habit of obedience to an arrogant self-appointed elite who are camouflaged as "concerned experts" who "feel our pain."

Everywhere we see and hear the mantra of "diversity." What is "diversity," really? It is a weapon that is being used to dumb down standards. A clear example of such a weapon is the quota system (racial preferences) that mandates placement of less-qualified minorities in jobs and in universities. This diversity shell game does more than merely degrade standards, it also allows the Left to buy minority votes with other people's money.

Using "salami tactics," the Left play off rich against poor, Black against white, English against Spanish, young against old. They transfer tax money taken from the public to

whatever minority can be bought. In that way they will and do create coalitions of the aggrieved. These are loose and shifting coalitions, having nothing in common except cultivated envy and hatred. The Left have infiltrated the media and education at every level with a doctrine called “political correctness.” This insidious doctrine allows the resources of the people to be used to fund the machinery designed to destroy the liberty of the people itself. The Left has arranged for us to pay for our own execution. It is the ultimate shell game, demonstrating devilish ingenuity.

The “diversity” game has another, less obvious use a weapon. It is also used to undermine the commonality of culture that is necessary for a nation to be a nation. It stands our national motto on its head. Instead of e pluribus unum (out of many, one), it seeks to substitute ex uno plura (out of one, many). It is the chief goal of the Left to break down all sense of nationhood in its support for an imperial UN. The biggest obstacle to one-world tyranny is the power of the United States.

Sad to say, much, if not most, of the impetus and resources dedicated to the murder of liberty is provided by the Jewish Left. Being Jewish, it grieves me to say this. If you doubt my premise, examine the organizations to which multibillionaires George Soros, Michael Bloomberg, and Peter Lewis give enormous amounts of money. Look at the Membership of the ACLU. Or simply review the relevant chapters in this book. The aspect of their behavior that is the most disgusting is their undisguised arrogance. The Jewish Left believe that they alone are in possession of the Truth. The question of Pontius Pilate “What is truth” concerns them not at all. Is this not Supreme Arrogance? The words of Moses, the Prophets, and Jesus, were aimed at such as these. Then as now, they are a stiff-necked people.

This leads me to my next topic:

Open Note to Christian Americans

Dear Brothers and Sisters,

From the time of the Reformation to today, you have had a profound respect for the Old Testament. Many of you have extended this reverence to the Jews of today, and to the State of Israel. I caution you of a danger. The Jews of the Left are the descendents of line of Korah. They are the descendents of those who zealously worshipped the Golden Calf; but today they worship its modern reincarnation in the form of Communism. It is one and the same. Moses and his followers slew thirty thousand of these apostates. The Jewish Left of today are the descendents of the Hellenizers who desecrated the Temple by accepting pagan rites. Judah Maccabeus slew one of their number as the apostate approached the altar to desecrate it with an unclean sacrifice. He showed that the holy days of Hanukkah are not a “Festival of Freedom,” but rather a “Festival of Obedience.” The Jewish Left pervert the meaning of all things: the true history of the Jewish people is no exception. It is to these men and women that the term “perfidious Jews” applies, and applies rightly.

They are also a danger to the existence of the State of Israel. As they hate the US, they hate Israel. And for the same reason: Israel stands as a Jewish state; they want to eliminate all sense of nationalism, or religious identification. They do this to pave the road in support of a world tyranny under a supranational government. The existence of

any state with particular and distinct traits is anathema to the Jewish Left. The political homogeneity of the world's population is their goal.

Therefore I implore you, make a distinction between the Jews of the Left, that is, the Jews of Hollywood, the New York Times, CBS, and the rest of the chattering classes... and those Jews who follow the tradition of Moses. Do be deluded by the Jewish Left, which know how to trade on the camouflage of Biblical Immunity. These men and women are the enemies not only of Christianity, but of un-perverted Judaism. Give them no blank checks! Fear them, as they are truly dangerous. I know of no greater danger in the world today.

The above having been said and my book having been read...now the unavoidable question: What can we do?

What's to be Done?

We are helpless in the face of this assault only if we choose to be. That being said, the Left (Jewish and otherwise) will fight like demons in defense of Hell. But there is a bright side to this struggle. To the degree that we are able to turn their assault, we will strengthen liberty. That is because they attack us only at our weak points. Our defense of liberty thus gives us more than the immediate delivery from tyranny; it also strengthens our ability to resist the inevitable attacks the future will bring. The defense of liberty is no one-time affair.

Here is my six-point program:

Specifics:

1. End of the Liberal Exemption: Uniform Application of the Law.

By the above I mean that any and all laws passed by the Congress will apply to all citizens in equal measure.

Some of the results of this change will be that Congress will no longer be able to exempt itself from its own social engineering. Currently, the Congress is exempt from much, if not all, EEOC legislation. Many of these rules and regulations make it all but impossible to get rid of bad employees. I want to see Congressman and Senators, like the rest of us, to be required to retain drones on their staff. If private industry and government agencies such as the VA, Social Security Administration, Postal Service, etc., are to be hamstrung, so should those who make these bad laws. After a few months of such uniform application of the laws, Congress will hold marathon sessions to repeal them en masse.

Also, why do laws involving Fair Housing and Section Eight housing select only white working class neighborhoods for sites? It is time to have Section Eight housing in the Kennedy compound at Hyannis Port. Also, Chappaqua, New York, the new home of the Clintons, should lose its Liberal Exemption and have its share of public housing. And I mean real public housing. No cherry-picking of prospective tenants to eliminate drug dealers and pimps. Let the Kennedys and Clintons share the scum also. If the "poor" cannot get to work (or the Welfare Bureau) from Hyannis Port or Chappaqua, the government can provide bussing. It has done so before. Let us not deprive the authors of liberalism of the benefits of liberalism.

2. End of Prosecution for Political Crimes.

We must abolish the prosecution for so-called “hate crimes.” The abolition would also preclude enhanced penalties for merely “regular” crime that has a “hate” component. The very existence of prosecution for “hate crimes” is the greatest threat to liberty that exists. This battering ram, used by the Left to suppress free speech, is the premier mechanism to punish those who question “political correctness.” The definition of “hate crimes” is so fluid, that the courts, to the extent that they are controlled by the Left, will rubber-stamp almost any repressive legislation.

Another problem with “hate crimes” is that it may lead to double jeopardy. Someone accused of a serious crime could go to trial under state law, and be found innocent. That should end the matter. But no. He may have to go to trial again, for the same alleged offense, but under a different statute, be it state or federal. The defendant not only has to undergo the emotional uncertainty of another trial, but the enormous legal expenses involved in attorneys’ fees and court costs. Another rent in the Bill of Rights.

There is irony here. The Jewish Left originated the current use of “hate crimes” as a criminal charge. It is one of the uses of the Holocaust, and it has become one more weapon in its assault upon liberty. The irony is that the original use of “hate crime” prosecutions would be the Inquisition. Under the Inquisition, one’s religious motivation could make the difference between life and death. But the Jewish Left is an equal-opportunity user of tyrannical methods. (See my chapter on Marcuse’s Repressive Tolerance).

3. Flat Tax

Government use of tax revenue before the Income Tax Amendment was to supply the legitimate needs of the Federal Government. Since the advent of the Income Tax, and especially since the New Deal, the purpose of taxation has undergone a dramatic shift. Using the “general welfare” clause of the Constitution, the left have gone from meeting needs to creating needs. To create needs is to create dependency. To create dependency is to buy votes.

In the process of trolling for votes, campaigning on “soak the rich” plays well. Karl Marx gave this mantra a basis in political and economic theory, so it has the appearance of being less crass than it is in reality. The Marxist strategy that sets poor against rich makes the rich poor without making the poor rich. All are equal in their poverty. Visit Cuba...

We must acknowledge that the primary purpose of taxation today is social manipulation. Meeting legitimate Federal financial needs is a distant second. Given this reality, a flat tax will easily meet legitimate Federal needs. Given a flat tax, for politicians to campaign in favor of raising tax rates, absent clear, present, and obvious need, would be political suicide. The “soak the rich” ploy simply cannot work when a tax hike affects everyone equally.

4. No Representation without Taxation.

Karl Marx stated that those who do not work do not eat. There is nothing in our Constitution requiring a franchise with no limits. We can limit the franchise, providing that race or sex is not the criterion. Accordingly, I propose that anyone who has been on public assistance in the calendar year of a given election cycle may not vote in federal elections in that calendar year. I can hear the outcry now: This is racist!! It will

disempower blacks!! My answer: Empathically Yes! And Yes again! But let us look at the matter more fully. They are not (temporarily) disenfranchised because they are black. The Left intentionally created a dependent community, targeting blacks in order to create a dependable voting block. So who is racist? The Left created the Welfare Rights Organization, using blacks as cannon fodder in the war against civilization. So who is racist? The Left created the AFDC program that destroyed the black family-with the intent to denigrate black males; to make them superfluous. So who is the real racist in this calculus?

The real racist is the Jewish Left which have manipulated too much of the black community into an Army of the Discontent, to be used as a weapon against liberty. To the extent that limiting the franchise has disparate impact on the black community, the limitation is but a mirror of the success of the premeditated racist actions of the Jewish Left in manipulating the black community.

5. US out of UN: UN out of US

The UN is a union of beggars and thieves. It serves no useful purpose. Its presence in New York gave our enemies a platform for spying during the Cold War. It provides a stage upon which petty despots may masquerade as sober statesman. It is nothing more than a high-priced costume ball, paid for by the US taxpayer. Moreover, if it can do little good, it can do much evil.

A global alliance such as the UN is too unwieldy to achieve any laudable goal. Since it represents every nation, the mutually contradictory interests of individual nations will prevent any useful action on the part of the UN. In addition, sub-blocks of nations will coalesce as their common interest dictates, and these purpose-driven alliances will be much more important in shaping UN policy than any overarching common good.

The real function of the UN has become to create a conduit through which to channel the wealth of productive nations to the nations which are unwilling to allow a free-enterprise economy. But free enterprise is the indispensable prerequisite for national economic self-sufficiency. Thus the petty tyrants who comprise most of the UN membership are obligate parasites. We see the failure of our own welfare state writ large as it goes global.

Role of Regional Alliances

The above being said does not mean we are obligated to go it alone. The success of NATO for many decades after World War II is an example of a regional alliance established to meet the specific common needs of a particular group of nations at a specific time. Such purpose-oriented groups, sharing common and limited goals, can be very effective. These are the sorts of alliances that we should arrange, as the international situation dictates.

6. Rein in the Foundations

There is an enormous amount of money at the disposal of tax-exempt foundations. Among the best-known are the Carnegie, Rockefeller, Ford, and John and Catherine MacArthur Foundations. The trustees of these foundations have vast sums of money at their disposal with which to influence public opinion. The trustees of these foundations are not popularly elected, and answer to no one. They have power over the public without public oversight. To the extent that they are tax-exempt, the public funds these

foundations. Their tax-exempt status is based on their being charitable organizations. But to a large extent, they are advocacy organizations. They alone determine for what causes they advocate. Since they benefit from tax-favored treatment, what it boils down to is taxpayer funded of private political advocacy. We must stop this abuse of tax exemption. Either the foundations should be restricted to funding pure nuts and bolts research, or they should lose all tax-favored status, and be required to register as lobbying organizations.

Final Remark

An unsuspecting reader of my Conclusion will presume me to be a racist. The Left will confirm this, labeling me an anti-black, anti-Hispanic, self-hating Jew. With Satanic Cunning, the Left have cast the paradigm so that any criticism of them or their policies is so perceived. This perception has been manufactured with intent. Its intention is to marginalize any criticism as racist, and thus beyond the pale of discussion. And, in their agenda, beyond the protection of free speech. After subverting the First Amendment, they are well on their way to imposing tyranny upon us by nullifying those of the remaining freedoms that stand in their way. They further want to add new ones, euphemistically called “economic rights.”

They seek to lead us down the road to serfdom. If we don't stop them, they will succeed.

Americans, wake up before it is too late!!

GLOSSARY

Aggada: That part of Jewish Scriptural (including Talmud and Midrash) literature that is expressed by stories and allegories.

Arminian: An eponymous term derived from Jacobus Arminius (1560–1609), a Dutch Protestant Divine who rejected the rigid predeterminism of classic Calvinism. He is the spiritual father of Methodism.

Ashkenazim: Jews whose ancestors came from Western Europe, especially Germany.

Aufklärung: The German Enlightenment of the late eighteenth century. Immanuel Kant was its most notable figure.

Dhimmi: An Arabic term. It is a description of the status of Jews and Christians in Muslim states. It is drawn from Koranic precepts, and thus is part of the Sharia, or Muslim law code.

Eschatology: The study of matters relating to the end of days, or end times.

Gemara: Rabbinic commentary on the Mishnah; written out ca. AD 400.

Grossdeutsch: Term for an empire, largely German, headed by the Hapsburg Emperors of Austria-Hungary. The Grossdeutsch state would include non-Germans such as Hungarians and Czechs.

Hasidism: A term for several sects of Jews which came into being in Eastern Europe around AD 1700. They are strictly orthodox and are remarkable for their long black coats, large black hats, and flowing beards. Their religious practices stress joy in God by song, dance, and exuberant prayer. They are looked down upon by the many Jews

because they are (supposedly) unsophisticated. They are a reminder and embarrassment to many Jews who wish “to pass.” Their voting patterns are very conservative, and social views are close, if not identical, with those of the Christian right.

Halacha: The Code of Jewish Law. The religious, personal, and social practices of orthodox Jews.

Hellenists: Those Jews, who, at the time following the Second Temple, accepted Greek culture as opposed to traditional Judaism. Bitter enemies of orthodoxy, and frequent collaborators with the Greek overlords of Palestine. Today’s Jewish Left are the modern equivalents of Hellenists.

Hillul ha-Shem: The performance of any act that would pointedly (and usually intentionally) dishonor God. Literally “Desecrate the Name.”

Hoffaktor: Similar to Hofjude. A Jewish officer of the court of a king or prince. The Hoffaktor’s duties were specifically financial.

Hofjude: Court Jew. Refers to any Jewish administrator in the court of a king or prince. Usually in Germany or Austria.

Kabbalah: A mystical and metaphysical expression of Judaism. Study of Kabbalah is reserved for Jewish scholars of advanced years and advanced sacred learning. Although highly mystical, it is a legitimate course of Jewish study. The modern Hassidim are deeply influenced by Kabbalah. Within Orthodox Judaism, the Kabbalistic approach is in contrast to the traditional orthodox practice. The more traditional orthodox consider the Kabbalists to be “too far out.” The three principle texts that comprise the Kabbalah are the Sefer Ha-Bahir, Zohar, Sefer Yezirah

Kiddush ha-Shem: An act that honors God (literally “blessing the Name”).

Kleindeutsch: Term for a Germanic empire led by Prussia, and excluding the non-German peoples of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

Midrash: A compilation of tales and stories, probably put together after the destruction of the First Temple. This work gives guidance in interpreting Torah.

Mishnah: Oral Torah, Second Scripture. Oral Law given by God to Moses at Mt. Sinai. Written down about AD 200 by Judah ha-Nasi. At least equal in authority to Five Books of Moses.

Mitziyah: Yiddish term for a good bargain.

Mitzvot: Good deeds.

Parthians: An ancient Persian-speaking people. Frequently at war with Greece and Rome.

Sanhedrin: Supreme Court and legislative body of ancient Israel.

Shtetl: The term for a Jewish village in Russia, Lithuania, and Poland. They were dissolved in the Soviet Union after the Communist takeover, and wiped out elsewhere by the Nazis in World War II. Fiddler on the Roof is based on Shtetl life.

Sephardic: Those Jews whose ancestors came from Spain and Portugal.

Talmud: The texts of the Mishnah and Gemara together comprise the Talmud.

Tanakh: The term for the Torah (Five Books), Prophets, and Writings. The Writings comprise Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Chronicles.

Third Rome: The Principality of Muscovy.

Tikkun ha-Olam: An injunction to mankind in Kabbalah. It requires us to “repair the world” through prayer and obedience to God’s will. It is entirely metaphysical. Recently, the Jewish Left has perverted it into a call for Socialism.

Torah: The Five Books of Moses.

Tractate: One of the six divisions of the Mishnah.

Yiddish: A dialect of German, spoken by many East European Jews. When the Jews were forced out of Germany at the time of the crusades and after, they took Yiddish with them to Poland-Lithuania.

APPENDIX

Government watchdogs and advocates

- Campaign for America’s Future
- Center for American Progress
- Center for Public Integrity
- Center for Responsive Politics
- Center for the Study of Responsive Law [1]
- Common Cause
- Democracy for America
- Fund for Constitutional Government [2]
- Glaser Progress Foundation [3]
- Government Accountability Project
- Institute for Policy Studies
- National Security Archive
- New America Foundation
- New Democrat Network
- People for the American Way
- Privacy International
- Progressive Majority [4]
- Progressive Maryland [5]
- Progressive Policy Institute
- Project On Government Oversight [6]

- Schumann Center for Media and Democracy
- Transparency International
- TrueMajority
- Truth-Telling Project [7]
- Elections
- America Coming Together
- Americans For Democratic Action
- Campaign Legal Center [8]
- Center for Voting and Democracy
- Election Defense Alliance [9]
- League of Conservation Voters
- League of Pissed Off Voters [10]
- League of Rural Voters [11]
- Open Debates [12]
- Progressive Democrats of America
- Quixote Foundation [13]
- Rock the Vote
- Verified Voting [14]
- Fundraising
- 21st Century Democrats
- ActBlue
- Council for a Livable World
- EMILY's List
- IPac [15]
- Media Fund
- National Committee for an Effective Congress
- OpenSecrets.org [16]
- Public Campaign [17]
- Law
- American Civil Liberties Union
- American Constitution Society
- Alliance for Justice
- Berkman Center for Internet and Society

- Brennan Center for Justice [18]
- Center for Constitutional Rights
- Earthjustice (formerly Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund)
- Electronic Frontier Foundation
- First Amendment Center
- Free Expression Policy Project [19]
- Human Rights First
- Institute for Democratic Studies [20]
- Lambda Legal
- Lawyers for Libraries [21]
- National Lawyers Guild
- Southern Poverty Law Center
- Stanford Center for Internet and Society
- Economy
- 2030 Center [22]
- Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities
- Citizens for Tax Justice
- Center for Economic and Policy Research
- Center on Budget & Policy Priorities [23]
- Economic Policy Institute
- Future of American Democracy Foundation[24]
- Mobilization for Global Justice
- National Priorities Project
- Taxpayers for Common Sense [25]
- United for a Fair Economy

Books

[contents of “books” omitted by author]

Media advocates

- Activist Media Project [27]
- Alicia Patterson Foundation [28]
- Center for Creative Voices in Media [29]
- Center for Digital Democracy [30]

- Center for Investigative Reporting [31]
- Center for Media and Democracy (PR watch)
- Citizens for Independent Public Broadcasting [32]
- Free Expression Policy Project [33]
- Free Press [34]
- Fund for Investigative Journalism [35]
- Glaser Progress Foundation [36]
- Independent Media Institute [37]
- Indymedia [38]
- Institute for Public Accuracy
- Media Alliance [39]
- Media for Democracy [40]
- Media Educational Foundation [41]
- Media Justice Network [42]
- MediaMatters [43]
- Otto Haas Charitable Trust
- Park Foundation [44]
- People for Better TV
- Project Censored
- Quixote Foundation [45]
- The Spin Project [46]

Media outlets

- Adbusters Media Foundation
- Adbusters
- Air America Radio
- Alternative Radio [47]
- AlterNet [48]
- The American Prospect
- The Atlantic Monthly
- Bad Subjects
- The Baffler [49]
- Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars [50]
- Business Ethics [51]

- Bush Greenwatch [52]
- Buzzflash [53]
- ColdType [54]
- Common Dreams
- Consumer Reports
- Cursor.org [55]
- Counterpunch
- Daily Misleader [56]
- Democracy Now! [57]
- Dissent (magazine) [58]
- Dollars and Sense
- Free Speech TV
- Grist [59]
- Guerilla News Network [60]
- Harper's
- In These Times
- Left Business Observer [61]
- Liblogs
- London Review of Books
- Media Matters [62]
- Mother Jones
- MoveOn.org [63]
- Moving Ideas Network [64]
- The Nation [65]
- New Left Review
- The New Yorker
- New York Review of Books
- NOW with Bill Moyers
- Pacifica Radio [66]
- The Progressive
- Progressive Bloggers
- The Progress Report [67] (American Progress Action Fund)
- Salon.com [68]

- TomPaine.com [69]
- Wiretap (magazine) [70]
- Z Magazine
Technology
- Center for Democracy and Technology
- Center for Digital Democracy [71]
- Center for Social Media [72]
- Chilling Effects
- Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility
- Consumer Project on Technology [73]
- CopyNight [74]
- Council for Responsible Genetics
- Creative Commons
- Downhill Battle
- Electronic Frontier Foundation
- Electronic Privacy Information Center
- freeculture.org [75] (student group)
- Free Expression Policy Project [76]
- Free Software Foundation
- IP Justice
- IPac [77]
- Institute for Global Communications
- International Center for Technology Assessment [78]
- Internet Archive
- League for Programming Freedom
- Libraries for the Future [79]
- Online Policy Group
- Participatory Culture Foundation [80]
- Participatory Politics Foundation
- Peacefire
- Public Knowledge
- Public Patent Foundation
- Union for the Public Domain [81]

- Universities Allied for Essential Medicines [82]
- Verified Voting (electronic voting) [83]
- Education
 - American Library Association
 - Center for Commercial-Free Public Education [84]
 - Child Development Project [85]
 - Coalition of Essential Schools [86]
 - Commercial Alert [87]
 - Commercialism in Education Research Unit [88]
 - Educators for Social Responsibility [89]
 - FairTest [90]
 - National Education Association (teachers)
 - Park Foundation [91]
 - Sudbury School
 - Teach for America [92]
 - Alfie Kohn
 - oNo Contest: The Case Against Competition
 - oPunished By Rewards
 - Alex Molnar
 - oGiving Kids the Business
 - Citizen advocate groups
 - Abolition 2000 (nuclear testing) [93]
 - American Friends Service Committee [94]
 - Americans for Peace Now [95] (Israeli-Palestinian conflict)
 - Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation [96]
 - Center for Defense Information
 - Center for International Policy
 - Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
 - Council for a Livable World
 - Dads and Daughters
 - Doctors Without Borders
 - Federation of American Scientists
 - Fellowship of Reconciliation

- Food Not Bombs [97]
- Global Exchange
- Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD)
- Mobilization for Global Justice
- Nuclear Information and Resource Service
- Peace Action
- Peaceful Tomorrows [98]
- Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine
- Physicians for Social Responsibility
- School of the Americas Watch
- Sojourners [99]
- Union of Concerned Scientists
- Veterans for Peace
- Violence Policy Center
- Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom

Accessed from Wikipedia August 22, 2007 sv “Progressive Organizations”

Appendix II Study Design

Please find the data sheets as Appendix I

I reviewed the first 199 organizations on the list, in sequential order. There are about 200 organizations that follow the first 199 organizations, but the time necessary to review the additional 200 was too great.

I separated the reviewed organizations into three categories:

Those organizations that appear to be instruments of the Jewish Left.

Those organizations that seem to have non-Jewish funding and directorship.

Those organizations whose funding and directorship is indeterminate.

My criteria for categorization on the basis of Jewish influence were as follows:

If the founder(s) or principle funder(s) is/was Jewish.

If 30% or more of the boards of directors (or equivalent) are Jewish.

If either criterion was met, I categorized the organization as an agency of the Jewish Left.

The biggest problem was the “who is a Jew” question. This question has arisen under all sorts of contexts. In Israel, the Law of Return states that any Jew can migrate to Israel. Among orthodox Jews, the law governing who is a Jew is much more strict. The question also occurred under the Nazi state, and was addressed by the Nuremburg Laws of 1933.

One criterion consisted of assigning Jewish identity to anyone whose family name is typically Jewish, such as “Cohen” or “Kaplan.” I also assigned Jewish identity to people so known in popular culture, such as George Soros, or Peter Lewis. In many instances, Jews have names that are indeterminate. I was able to determine the status of some of these individuals by on-line biographical data. In the event I could make no reasonable determination, I assigned “indeterminate” to the individual.

The question has arisen in the “who is a Jew” controversy about the children of mixed marriages. According to Jewish Law (Halacha), anyone born of a Jewish mother is considered Jewish. I decided to consider anyone with one Jewish parent to be Jewish.

It is a great irony that I, who do not believe in racial preferences, should have to bother about this. But I must, because the Jewish Left has used the issue of racial preferences as a tool for the last quarter century. I must deal in this absurdity because they have forced my hand.

Raw data:

n= number of organizations reviewed

a=number of organizations assumed to be Jewish

b=number of organizations assumed to be not Jewish

c=number of organizations of undetermined status.

n=199 a=72 b=54 c=73

Percent identified as Jewish of grand total: “a” divided by “a+b+c”.

72 divided by 72+ 54+73= 37%.

Percent identified as Jewish after eliminating from the data base organizations of undetermined status.

72 divided by 54+72= 58%.

Meaningfulness of data:

The weaknesses of these conclusions are:

The method of determining “who is a Jew” is very crude.

There is no determination of whether the list taken from Wiki is exhaustive.

If the list taken from Wiki is not exhaustive, there is no way of determining why any particular organization is presented or not presented.

I did not examine the approx 200 remaining organizations on the original list. Hence “n” is not as large as it could be. Also, there may be some variance in the data as a function of its location in the original list; that is the earlier entries (analyzed) may differ in some way from the later entries (not analyzed).

The direction of error in identifying organizations assumed to be agencies of the Jewish Left is most likely to be in the direction of understatement. This is because so many Jews have either Anglicized their names, or changed their names so as to sound anything but Jewish. George Soros, born Schwartz, is a perfect example. So is Peter Lewis.

As a result of the limitations above, my work should be considered as a pilot study. Anyone who wishes is invited to pursue the issue further.

Bibliography

- Ahlstrom, Sydney. *A Religious History of the American People*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973.
- Ashburn, Frank D. *Peabody of Groton*. New York: Coward McCann, Inc., 1944.
- Baker, Liva. *Felix Frankfurter*. New York: Coward-McCann, 1966.
- Conquest, Robert. *The Harvest of Sorrow*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Conti, Count Egon. *The Rise of the House of Rothschild*. Boston: Western Islands Press, 1972.
- Coper, Rudolf. *Failure of a Revolution*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1955.
- Cottrell, Robert C. *Roger Nash Baldwin and the American Civil Liberties Union*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- Craig, Gordon A. *Germany: 1866-1945*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Dan, Joseph. *Kabbalah: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th ed. (1910).
- Encyclopedia Judaica. 1st ed. (1971).
- Encyclopedia Judaica. 2nd ed. (2006).
- Engels, Frederick. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, trans. by Alec West. New York: International Publishers, 1973.
- Fichte, JG. *Addresses to the German Nation*, trans by RF Jones and GH Turnbull. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1968.
- Gabler, Neal. *An Empire of Their Own*. New York: Doubleday, 1988.
- Grant, Michael. *The History of Ancient Israel*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948.
- Grant, Michael. *The Rise of Greeks*. New York: McMillan Publishing Co., 1987.
- Greenberg, Mark, et al. *The Black book of Communism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Griffith, Robert. *The Politics of Fear*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987.
- Grunberg, Richard. *Red Tide Rising in Bavaria*. London: Arthur Barker, Ltd., 1973.
- Halberstam, David. *The Powers That Be*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979.
- Haynes, John E. and Klehr, Harvey. *Venona: Decoding Soviet Espionage in America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Hecht, Ben. *Perfidy*. New York: Julian Messner, Inc., 1961.

Hegel, GFW Phenomenology of Spirit, trans. by AV Miller. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Hoffman, Michael A. Egypt Before the Pharaohs. New York: Dorset Press, 1979.

Holtz, Barry W. Back to the Sources: Reading the Classic Jewish Texts. New York: Summit Books, 1984.

Horowitz, David and Poe, Richard. The Shadow Party. Nashville, TN: Nelson Current, 2006.

Hubatsch, Walter. Frederick the Great of Prussia, trans. by Patrick Doran. London: Thames and Hudson, 1975.

Hunt, George T. The Wars of the Iroquois. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1940.

I Maccabees. Holy Scriptures, King James Version.

Janeway, Charles A. The Immune System in Health and Disease. London: Elsevier, 1999.

Kaplan, Aryeh. The Bahir Illumination. Maine: Samuel Weiser, Inc., 1979.

Kaufman, Michael T. The Life and Times of a Messianic Billionaire. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002.

Kissinger, Henry. A World Restored. New York: Grossett and Dunlap, 1964.

Kunstler, William M. My Life as a Radical Lawyer. New York: 1996.

Lewis, Flora. Red Pawn. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1965

Maimonides, Moses. The Guide for the Perplexed, trans by M. Friedlander. New York: Dover Publications, 1956.

Mardrus, JC and Mathers, P. (translators). The Thousand and One Nights, vol. II. London: Routledge Press, 1993.

Messerli, Jonathan. Horace Mann: A Biography. New York: Alfred A. Knop, 1972.

Milton, Joyce. The First Partner: Hillary Clinton. New York: William Morrow and Co., 1999.

Montesquieu, Baron de. The Spirit of the Laws, trans. by Thomas Nugent. London: Hafner Press, 1949.

Nevins, Allen. John D. Rockefeller: The Heroic Age of American Enterprise, Vol. I. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940.

Nolte, John. The Human Brain: An Introduction to Functional Anatomy. St. Louis: Mosby, 1999.

Padover, Saul K. The Revolutionary Emperor: Joseph II of Austria. London: Eyre and Spottswodie, 1967.

Pascal, Blaise. Pensées extraits. Paris: Nouveaux Classiques Larousse.

Rauschenbusch, Walter. Christianity and the Social Crisis. London: McMillan and Co., 1916.

Romerstein, Herbert and Breindel, Eric. *The Venona Secrets*. Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2000.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, trans by GDH Cole. *The Social Contract and Discourses*. London and

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Du contrat social*. Paris: GarnierFlammarion, 1966.

Sachar, Howard M. *A History of the Jews in America*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992.

Samuelson, Paul A. and Nordhaus, William D. *Economics*, 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1989.

Schapiro, Leonard. *Russian Studies*. New York: Viking-penguin Press, Inc., 1987.

Schirokauer, Arno. *Lassalle: The Power of Illusion and the Illusion of Power*, trans. by Eden and Cedar Paul. New York: The Century Co., 1932.

Sheehan, James J. *German History: 1770-1866*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1994.

Shotter, David. *The Fall of the Roman Republic*. London: Routledge Press, 1993.

Silver, Daniel J. *The Story of Scripture*. New York: Basic Books, 1990.

Slater, Robert. *Soros, The Unauthorized Biography*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Smith, Preserved. *The Age of the Reformation*. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1920.

Soros, George. *Soros on Soros*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1995.

Spong, John S. *A New Christianity for a New World*. San Francisco: HarperCollins Co., 2001.

Stern, Fritz. *Gold and Iron: Bismarck and Bleichroder*. New York: Vintage Books, 1977.

Strachey, James. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Works of Sigmund Freud*, vol. XVI. London: Hogarth Press. 1975.

Stumpf, Samuel Enoch. *Philosophy: History and Problems*, 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983.

Taylor, AJP. *The Hapsburg Monarchy, 1809-1918*. Chicago; The University of Chicago Press, 1976.

The Complete Art Scroll Siddur. New York: Mesorah Publications, 1995.

Thompson, Ewe. *Sarmatian Review*, Vol. XIX.I (1999)

Tiftt, E. and Jones, Alex S., *The Trust*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co. 1999.

Tokes, Rudolf L. *Bela Kun and the Hungarian Soviet Republic*. Stanford: 1967.

Tucker, Robert C. *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 2nd ed. New York: WW Norton and Co., 1987.

Wall, Joseph Frazier. *Andrew Carnegie*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1970.

Watch Tower Society. 1984. *New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures*, 3rd Ed. 1984. Watch Tower Society, Brooklyn, NY.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. by Talcott Parsons. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1976.

Weinstein, Alan and Vassiliev, Alexander. *The Haunted Wood*. New York: The Modern Library, 1999.

Wiggershaus, Rolf. *The Frankfurt School*, trans. by Michael Robertson. Cambridge, MA., The MIT Press, 1955.

Wolff, Robert P., Moore, Barrington, Marcuse, Herbert. *A Critique of Pure Tolerance*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

Zinn, Howard. *A People's History of the United States*. New York: Harper Collins, 1999.

INDEX OF NAMES

Aaron (brother of Moses), 23, 213.

Abraham, 21, 213.

Abt, John, 311.

Acheson, Dean, 246.

Addams, Jane, 270.

Adler, Julius Ochs, 273.

Adler, Solomon, 312.

Adorno, Theodor, 258.

Agrippa I, 71.

Agrippa, 68, 71.

Ahasuerus see Artaxerxes, 41.

Ahaz (King of Judah), 33.

Albright, Madeleine, 362.

Alexander the Great, 50, 52, 113.

Alinsky, Saul, 355, 356.

Antiochus IV Epiphanes, 51.

Antony, Marc, 67, 68.

Aquinas, Saint Thomas, 112, 114, 117.

Aristobolus, 60, 69.

Aristotle, 112-116, 118, 129.

Aron, Raymond, 141, 225.

Artaxerxes, 39, 41.

Augustine, (Catholic Saint), 91, 114, 126.

Bader-Ginsburg, Ruth, 362.

Baldwin, Roger Nash, 303-306.
Bar Kokhba, 80-81, 83, 86.
Barnett, Ida Wells, 289.
Barth, Alan, 278.
Bellow, Gary, 359.
Bellows, Jim, 278, 279.
Berle, Adolph, 313.
Berman, Jakub, 238.
Bernard of Clairvaux, 97.
Bismarck, Prince Otto von, 208-209, 211, 228.
Blair, Jason, 276.
Blavatsky, Helene, 248.
Bleichroder, Gerson von, 208-209, 211.
Block, Herbert, 278.
Bloomberg, Michael, 366.
Boudin, Kathy, 339
Boudin, Leonard, 339-340.
Brandeis, Louis, 264-265, 272.
Brown, H. Rap (aka Al-Amin, Jamil), 338.
Brown, Ron, 361.
Bruckner, Don, 279.
Burger, Sandy, 207.
Bursler, Norman, 312.
Calvin, John, 125, 151, 153.
Cardozo, Benjamin, 264-265.
Carmichael, Stokely (aka Ture, Kwame), 238.
Carnegie, Andrew, 241-242, 249.
Casas, Bartolome de las, 333.
Castro, Fidel, 324.
Catledge, Turner, 276.
Chamberlain, H. S, 215.
Charlemagne, 90, 95.
Charles I (King of England), 153-154.

Chauncey, Charles, 164.
Chesimard, Joanne (aka Assanta Shakur), 339.
Chmielnicki, Bogdan, 121-122, 128.
Christ, 98, 251.
Churchill, Winston, 318.
Cicero, M. Tullius, 65.
Clarke, Col. Carter, 315.
Claudius (Roman Emperor), 71, 78.
Clinton, Bill, 146, 207.
Clinton, Hillary, 143,146, 221, 236, 242, 357, 362, 364.
Cloward, Richard, 291, 296.
Coe, Frank, 312.
Coffin, William Sloane, 269.
Cohen, Benjamin, 268.
Cohen, Chaim, 328.
Collins, Henry, 311.
Constantine I (Roman Emperor), 84.
Constantinius II (Roman Emperor), 87.
Corcoran, Thomas G., 268.
Cromwell, Oliver, 155-157, 332.
Currie, Lauchlin, 312.
Cyrus (Persian Emperor), 38-39, 41-42, 73.
Da Costa, Uriel, 119, 133-135.
Daley, Richard Sr. (Mayor of Chicago), 65.
Daniel (Biblical figure), 37-39, 43.
Darius I, 39, 74.
Darwin, Charles, 247.
David (King of Israel), 70, 77, 116, 213.
Dowd, Maureen, 222.
Dubois, W.E.B., 287, 289, 296.
Duranty, Walter, 221, 323-324.
Eastman, Crystal, 270, 303.
Edelman, Marion Wright, 359.

Edelman, Peter, 359.
Edwards, John, 363.
Edwards, Jonathan, 254.
Eichmann, Adolph, 321, 325, 330, 334, 344.
Einstein, Albert, 130.
Eisner, Kurt, 231.
Eisner, Michael, 283.
Eliot, T. S., 358
Elizabeth I (Queen of England), 147, 152-153, 282.
Engels, Frederick, 147-148, 176, 217, 220, 306.
Ephriam, Benjamin, 207.
Ernst, Morris, 306.
Esau (Biblical figure), 293-294.
Ezra, 37, 39- 40, 42.
Ferguson, Colin, 340.
Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, 203-205, 214, 216.
Field, Noel, 326.
Fitzgerald, Edward, 311.
Ford, Gerald, 361.
Ford, Henry, 281.
Foster, Vince, 278.
Frankel, Max, 277.
Frankfurter, Felix, 264-266, 268, 270, 278, 305.
Frederick the Great, see Frederick William II
Frederick William II, 136, 179, 182-186, 190,193, 206.
Frick, Henry, 242.
Fuchs, Klaus, 313-314.
Gans, Eduard, 259.
Garland, Hamlin, 336.
Geffen, David, 283.
Geiger, Rabbi Abraham, 216.
Gilbert, Ben, 278.
Gobineau, Arthur, 215.

Goebbels, Josef, 324.
Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, 203.
Gold, William, 312.
Gombos, Gyula, 235.
Graham, Katherine (nee Meyer), 278.
Graham, Philip, 278.
Grunwald, Henry, 279
Guthman, Ed, 278, 279.
Hall, Theodore, 313, 314.
Halperin, Morton, 353.
Harun al-Rashid (Caliph), 93, 95.
Hays, Arthur Garfield, 274.
Hegel, G. W. F., 175, 178, 203-204, 216, 248, 253, 259.
Heine, Solomon, 207.
Henry VIII (King of England), 126, 151-152, 188.
Herbert, Bob, 277.
Herod, 7, 60, 67-72.
Hiss, Alger, 316.
Hitler, Adolph, 181, 200, 209, 257, 260-261, 280, 322.
Hobbes, Thomas, 133, 137-141, 143-144.
Hoffman, Abbie, 339.
Holdheim, Rabbi Samuel, 216.
Hophra (Pharaoh), 35.
Hopkins, Harry, 312, 317-318.
Horthy, Admiral Miklos, 235, 327.
Housman, Alan, 360.
Huang, John, 361.
Hume, David, 133.
Hunt, George, 334.
Hyrchanus I, 59-60.
Hyrchanus II, 67, 69.
Itzig, Daniel, 206-207.
Ivins, Molly, 277.

Jackson, Jessie, 64.
Jackson, Robert (U. S. Supreme Court Justice), 262.
Jacob (Jewish Patriarch), 293-294.
James, William, 252-253.
Jason (High Priest), 51.
Jehoiakim (King of Judah), 34.
Jellinek, Georg, 260-261.
Jeremiah, 34, 37.
Johnson, Lyndon B., 356, 359.
Jones, Alex S., 276.
Jones, Rev. Don, 385.
Joseph (Jewish Patriarch), 12, 16, 21-23, 40-41, 71, 256, 268, 319, 321, 342, 362-363.
Joseph II (Emperor of Austria), 186-188, 190, 193.
Judah (Maccabeus), 56, 367.
Judah ha-Nasi, 45, 375.
Judas Iscariot, 329.
Kaganovitch, Lazar, 321-322, 325, 327, 330.
Kant, Immanuel, 135, 157, 166-177, 203, 247, 374.
Kantor, Mickey, 360.
Karoli, Count Mihaly, 234.
Katzenberg, Jeffrey, 283.
Kelsen, Hans, 261-262.
Kennedy (family), 278, 356, 369.
Kennedy, Joseph P., 65.
Kennedy, Robert, 279.
Kennedy, Ted, 64, 146, 278-279.
Kerry, John, 362.
Kirchheim, Otto, 258
Kopechne, Mary Jo, 278.
Kramer, Charles, 311
Kroft, Steve, 343-344, 351.
Kun, Bela, 234-235, 239.
Kunstler, William, 337, 339-341.

Landauer, Gustav, 231.
Lasalle, Ferdinand (nee Lassal), 227.
Laud, William, 154-155.
Leibknecht, Karl, 230.
Lelyveld, Joseph, 227.
Lerner, Michael, 108, 360-361.
Leverett, John, 164-165.
Levine, Eugene, 232.
Lewis, Peter, 366.
Lindsey, John (former Mayor of New York City), 292, 356.
Lipp, Dr. Franz, 231.
Locke, John, 132-133, 143-146, 148.
Long, Huey, 357.
Lord Protector, see Cromwell, Oliver
Louis XVI (King of France), 192.
Lovett, Robert Morss, 270.
Luce, Henry, 279.
Luria, Isaac (Rabbi), 108.
Luther, Martin, 90, 124-125, 151.
Luxemburg, Rosa, 230.
Lynd, Robert S, 258.
Maccabeus, Judah, 56, 122, 367.
Maimonides, Moses, 46, 114-118.
Mann, Horace, 244-246, 249, 273.
Mannheim, Karl, 258.
Marcuse, Herbert, 258, 297-301, 313.
Maria Theresa (Austro-Hungarian Empress), 188.
Mariamne (wife of Herod I), 67-69.
Marx, Karl, 14, 25., 135, 141, 143, 147-148, 169, 175-177, 193, 217-218, 220-2, 224-228, 234, 248, 283, 304, 306, 327, 329, 337, 358, 370-371.
Mattathias (Maccabeus), 54-55, 57.
McCarran, Sen. Patrick, 266.
McCarthy, Joseph (Senator), 314-317, 337.

Menelaus (High Priest), 51.
Merz, Charles, 274.
Metternich, Prince Clemens von, 200-201, 206, 210.
Meyer, Eugene, 277-278, 281.
Meyer, Louis B., 282.
Miller, Arthur, 315.
Milner, Lucille (nee Lowenstein), 305.
Mithradates I (King in Persia), 74.
Mohammed, 75.
Montesqueieu, Baron Charles de, 179.
Mordecai, 41.
Morganthau, Henry, 312.
Moses, 24, 25, 40, 43, 46, 106, 114, 118, 166, 253, 329, 366, 367-368, 375-376.
Moynihan, Daniel, 361.
Muratalli II, 27.
Nabopolassar, 34.
Napoleon Bonaparte, 181, 199-200, 202, 205, 210, 259.
Nebuchadnezzar, 34, 35, 37.
Neco (Pharaoh), 34.
Nehemiah, 39, 40, 42, 43, 156.
Neier, Aryeh, 354.
Nero, 80, 181.
Neumann, Franz, 258, 261-262, 313.
Neumann, Michael, 262.
Newton, Isaac, 130-133.
Nixon, Richard, 316-317, 361.
Nye, Gerald (Senator), 307-308.
Obama, Barack, 362.
Ochs, Adolph, 272-273.
Ochs, Julius Adler, 273.
Ochs, Julius, 272.
Ovington, Mary White, 269-270, 286, 289.
Owen, Robert, 170.

Perl, William, 313-314.
Perlo, Victor, 311.
Phillip II (King of Macedonia), 154.
Pilate, Pontius, 70, 366.
Piven, Francis Fox, 291.
Plato, 118, 294.
Pompey (the Great), 59-60.
Pulitzer, Joseph, 323.
Rahman, Sheik Omar Abdel, 354.
Rakosi, Matyas (nee Rosenkrantz), 234-235.
Rameses II, 27.
Randolph, A. Philip, 276.
Reagan, Ronald, 360.
Rehoboam, 32.
Reich, Robert, 361-362.
Renoir, Jean, 320.
Riady, James, 361.
Ricardo, David (economist), 222.
Rich, Frank, 227.
Roosevelt, Franklin FDR Franklin Delano Roosevelt, 246, 265, 268, 312, 315, 317.
Rosenberg, Ethyl, 316
Rosenberg, Julius, 316.
Rosenkrantz, Matyas. See Rakosi, Matyas, 234-235.
Rothschild (family), 210.
Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 193-197, 221.
Samuel, 29-30.
Saul, 30.
Schapiro, Leonard, 259-260.
Schmitt, Carl, 261.
Schwarz, Frederick A. O., 360.
Sharpton, Al, 64.
Shishak (Pharaoh), 32.
Silver, Daniel (Rabbi), 24, 39, 42.

Silvermaster, Gregory, 312.
Silvermaster, Helen, 312.
Solomon, 30, 32, 36.
Soros, George (nee Gyorgy Schwartz), 307, 339, 341-346, 352-355, 357, 362-363, 366.
Sowell, Thomas, 295.
Spiegelman, Art, 237.
Spielberg, Steven, 283.
Spinoza, Baruch, 119, 133, 135.
Spock, Benjamin, 269.
Stalin, Joseph, 140, 143, 217, 238, 261, 304, 312, 317, 319, 321, 324, 335, 341.
Stern, Andrew, 357.
Stern, Sol, 292.
Stewart, Lynne, 354-355.
Streator, George, 275-276.
Sulzberger, Arthur Hayes, 273.
Sulzberger, Arthur Ochs (nickname "Punch"), 273.
Sulzberger, Arthur Ochs, Jr. (nicknamed "Pinch"), 276.
Sulzberger, Iphigene (nee Ochs), 272-274.
Summers, Laurence, 142, 232.
Szumuelly, Tibor, 234.
Taylor, William, 312.
Tetzl, Johannes, 125.
Thomas, Clarence, 295.
Tifft, Susan E., 276.
Tiglath-Pileser, 32.
Tillich, Paul, 358.
Toller, Ernest, 231.
Treitschke, Heinrich von, 215, 341.
Trotsky, Leon (nee Bronstein), 11, 322.
Trotter, William, 289.
Truman, Harry, 315.
Valley, Arco, 231.
Vespasian (Roman Emperor), 80.

Villard, Oswald Garrison, 270.
Volkov, Anatole, 312.
Voltaire, 192.
Wald, Jerry, 282.
Walling, William, 289.
Ward, Dr. Harry F., 270.
Washington, Booker T., 287.
Washington, George, 335.
Weber, Max, 161.
Weinglass, Leonard, 340.
Weizman, Chaim, 328.
White, Harry Dexter, 312.
Whitefield, George, 164.
Wiley, George Alvin, 291-292.
Wilhelm I (German Kaiser), 227.
Wilhelm II (German Kaiser), 229, 256, 297.
Williams, Walter, 295.
Winant, John, 318.
Witt, Nathan, 311.
Xerxes I, 74.
Zedekiah (King of Judah), 34.
Zevi, Shabbetai, 122.
Zinn, Howard, 301, 314, 332-337, 350-351.
Zukor, Adolph, 282.

GENERAL INDEX

A People's History of America, 314.
academy (generic term), 267, 335.
ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union), 267, 269-270, 303-304, 306, 310, 366.
Act of Separation, 152.
Act of Supremacy, 126.
adaptation, 174.
Addresses to the German Nation, 204.

Adorno, Theodor, 258.
AFDC (Aid for Families with Dependent Children), 371.
aggada, 44, 374.
Allgemeine Staatslehre, 260.
Amsterdam, 134-135.
An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, 132.
Anatolia, 73.
ancien régime, 191.
Anschluss, 258, 264, 267, 291.
anti religion. def., 225
anti-Semitism, 18, 189, 210, 311, 342.
Arabian Nights, 94.
Arabian Peninsula, 75, 88.
Aram-Damascus, 32-33.
arbitrage, 352.
Ark of the Covenant, 36, 108.
Arkansas, 358
Arminianism, 155, 374.
ashkenazi, 86, 119, 374.
Asia Minor, 64, 69, 73-74, 81.
Assyria, 30, 32-34.
atemporal, 154.
atheism, 14, 55, 133.
atheist, 135, 252, 266.
Athens, 16, 48-49, 52, 65, 115.
atom bomb, 313.
Attica Correctional Institution, 339.
Aufklärung, 135-136, 374.
Auschwitz, 275.
Austria, 202, 205-206, 208-211, 235.
Austro-Hungary, Empire, 229, 233, 375.
autarky, see economy, closed.
Aztec, 285, 334.

Baader-Meinhoff Gang, 360.
Babylonia, 33, 50, 77.
Babylonian Exile, 57, 285.
Baghdad, 93.
Bahir (Book of), 107, 110.
Balts, 321-322.
Bar Kokhba, 80-81, 83, 86.
Barnard College of Columbia University, 272.
Bavaria, 97, 230-232, 239, 272.
Bay of Pigs, invasion of, 278.
Belgium, 46, 202.
Belsen, 319.
benevolent despots, 157, 182, 186, 179, 286.
Berlin University, 260.
Biblical Immunity, 368.
Bildung, 243.
Bill of Rights, U.S., 301, 306, 370.
Black Caucus (US Congressional), 65.
Black Death, 98.
Black power, 338.
Black rage, 340.
Black vote, 290, 294.
Blavatsky, Helene, 248.
Blood of Kings, The, 334.
blue laws, 168.
Boston Ministerial Association, 247.
bourgeoisie, 223, 228.
Brandeis University, 297.
Brattle Street Church, 165.
Britain, 30, 64.
Budapest, 234-235.
Byzantines, 75-76, 95.
Byzantium, 75.

Caliphate, 217.

Calvinism, 126-127, 130, 150, 152-159, 160-161, 163-165, 168, 249, 264, 374.

Cambodia, 323.

Camp Kinderland, 332.

Canaan, 22, 27, 156.

canon law, 147, 187.

Carchemish, Battle of, 33-34.

Carnegie Corporation, 359.

Carthage, 62.

cattle futures, 361.

Cave, Allegory of, 294-295.

CBS, 343, 351, 367.

Central Europe, 13, 202, 208-209, 211, 229, 286.

central government, 210, 242, 298.

Chappaquiddick (incident), 278.

Chattanooga (TN), 272.

Chattanooga Daily News, 272.

chattering classes, 326, 368.

children: as political tools, 359; as victims, 97, 169, 237, 243, 319-320, 322; education and raising of: 14, 86, 148, 199, 220-221, 274, 280, 288, 332; mentioned; 15, 37-38, 156-158, 240, 285, 293.

Children's Defense Fund, 359.

Chosen People, 24, 40.

Christian Century (newspaper), 281.

Christian Right, 17, 374.

Hanukkah, 55, 367.

Christians, 17, 43, 87-88, 93, 95, 97-98, 109, 134, 187, 237, 374.

Christ-killer, 177.

CIA (Central Intelligence Agency), 258.

City Journal, 292.

Civil Constitution of the Clergy, 198.

Civil Liberties Bureau, 303.

civil liberties, 305.

civil rights, 135, 179-180, 189, 200, 259, 269, 279, 306.

Civil War (U.S.), 167, 241, 286.

class: middle, 152-153, 165, 227, 232, 234, 270, 291, 337; peasant, 61; priestly, 44, 57, 213; ruling, 64, 93, 199, 326; structure, 13, 65, 91, 93, 139, 183, 185, 191, 204, 240, 254, 286, 320, 326, 330, 335-336; struggle, 65, 176, 182, 195, 204, 219-221, 355; working, 160, 169, 369; yeoman, 63.

clientela, 64-65, 138, 145, 290, 292, 331

Clinton Administration, 207, 360, 362.

Clinton-Jew relationships, 207.

Cloward-Piven Strategy, 291-292.

Cold War, the, 353, 371.

collaborators: with Greeks, Jews among; 375; with Nazis, Jews among, 345.342, 344-345.

Columbia University, 257, 262, 269-270, 272, 291.

Comitia Centuriata, 61.

commissars, 299, 321.

Communism: Jews and, 147, 321, 336, 367; movement, 191, 232, 236, 321; practice of, 170, 224, 235; theory, 138, 172, 221, 224-225, 230, 256, 300-301, 305, 311.

Communist Manifesto, The, 217.

Communist Party (USA), 290, 314, 316, 337, 340.

Communists, 196, 222, 224, 226-228, 232, 235-236, 256, 262, 268, 313, 316, 321, 323, 325.

competition, 208, 244.

Concilium Plebis, 61-62.

Confederation of the Rhine, 203.

Congregational, 47, 127, 162.

Conquest, of Palestine, 27-28, 36.

Constantinople, 74-76, 96.

Constitution of the United States, 143, 266-267, 286, 301, 335, 370-371.

Consul, 62, 80.

corruption, 174, 180, 224.

cosmic consciousness, 252

cossacks, 121, 144.

courts, co-optation of, 369.

CPUSA, see Communist Party, U. S.

credit, see money.

Crisis (NAACP Journal), 276.

Crucible, The (play by Arthur Miller), 315.,

Crusades: First, 96-97, 99; Second, 97; People's, 96; Princes, 96, mentioned, 93-94, 98, 111, 119, 376.

Cuba, 139, 161, 180, 196, 335, 370.

Current Anthropology, 334.

Czechoslovakia, 123.

Dachau, 275.

Danube River, 64, 123.

Darwinism, 247-248; social, 247-248.

Das Kapital, 217.

Dead Sea, 27-28.

Dearborn Independent, 281

deceit, 307, 311, 314, 317, 325, 328, 346.

Declaration of Independence (U.S.), 259.

Deists, 192.

democracy, French, 13, 198; ancient Greek, 48, ancient Roman, 61; United States, 267, 289; mentioned, 191, 236, 246, 305, 307, 354.

Democratic Party, Democrats (United States), 65.

despicables, 329.

despotism, oriental, 39.

Despots: benevolent, 179, 286; general, 157, 228, 371.

determinism, religious, 154, 157; social, 192.

determinist, 135, 244.

Deuteronomy, 24, 43.

Dhimmitude, 93, 374.

Diaspora, 13, 81, 84, 177.

dictatorship of the professoriate, 267.

distribution, 17, 119, 139, 145, 176, 224, 265, 301.

distributor, 223.

diversity, 335, 365-366.

Divine Presence, 36, 165.

Donation of Constantine, 84-85.

double determination, 159.

drug culture, 293.

DSM IV, 346, 349.

Duke University, 232.

economy: command, 222, 301, 372; market, 162, 292; zero-sum, 196; mentioned, 242.

Egypt: Joseph in, 12, 21-23, 27, 73, 363; geography, 19-20, 30, 33, 60; mentioned 22-23, 27, 30, 33-34, 57, 61, 75, 79, 87-88, 93.

Ein Sof, 107.

élite: intellectual, 225, 232, 244-247, 254, 257, 298, 300, 365; Jewish, 39-40, 89; Negro, 287; Protestant, 165-168, 204, 240, 245-247, 254, 269, 291-292, 301, 303, 311, 325.

Encyclopédie, 133.

Enlightenment: English, 137; German, 14, 135, 193; general 13-14, 83, 117, 129, 132, 165, 286, 374.

entitlements, 307, 359.

episcopal: generic, 99, 127, 162; specific Church, 251, 246.

Eretz Israel, 19-21, 28, 39-40, 50-52, 59, 69-71, 74, 76—79, 81, 86, 87.

eschatology, 106, 116, 374.

Esperanto, 341.

Espionage, 186, 224, 262, 268, 311, 313-314, 316, 318, 326, 337,.

Estates général, 197.

Esther, Book of, 40-43, 376.

Ethiopia, 30.

eunomia, 40.

Euphrates River Valley, 19, 33, 61, 74.

Europe: Central, 13, 81, 84-85, 208-209, 211, 229, 233; Eastern, 85, 87, 99, 122, 177, 191, 272, 322, 327, 374; southern, 158; Western, 15, 60, 90-91, 93, 111, 158, 160, 327, 374; mentioned, 73, 83, 95-96, 98, 119-120, 123-124, 126, 131, 142, 161, 181, 200, 202-203, 206, 217, 256, 259-260, 286, 299, 301, 312, 318, 320-321, 326, 337, 355.

evil, 12, 15, 18, 70, 103, 105, 109, 116, 123, 126, 141 216, 258, 293, 299, 323-326, 330, 332, 334, 343, 372.

evolution, 174, 229, 247.

ex cathedra, 47.

Exile, Babylonian, 35, 37, 57, 71, 285; from England, 264; mentioned, 69, 213, 218.

Exodus, 20, 24, 27.

family structure: Negro, 287, 290, 358; mentioned, 14, 147, 220-222, 225, 281, 286-287, 290, 306, 358.

fascism, 191, 257, 282.

Fertile Crescent, 19

First Torah, see Tanakh.

First Unitarian Church of Baltimore, 166.

First World War, see World War I.

flat tax, 370.

formation, 243.

foundations: MacArthur, 372; Ford, 308; mentioned, 255, 308, 372-373.

France: culture, 124, 199; and Germany, 202-203, 208; law, 200, 236, 259, 325; geography, 62, 64, 79, 89-90; 123, 202; government, 151-152, 181, 191, 197, 198; Jews, 86-87, 96-97, 119, 158; religion, 90, 117, 152, 180, 186.

Franco-Prussian War, 208.

Frankenstein effect, 16, 24, 235, 261.

Frankfurt: city, 257; Institute, 256-257; School, 256, 258, 263, 326; University, 257.

free market, 139, 162, 173, 206, 256, 291.

free will, 135, 137, 244.

freedom: economic, 179; personal/moral; 126, 131, 143, 182, 205, 367; political, 59, 180, 183, 190, 240, 297, 299. 307, 346, 365; of speech, press, and worship, 11, 56, 133, 142, 161-162, 192, 208, 254, 258, 297.

freikorps, 230, 232.

French Revolution, 7, 191, 193, 356.

G. A. O. See Government Accounting Office.

Galicia, 234.

Galilee, land of, 59, 80-81; Sea of, 20, 28.

Gaul, 64, 79, 81, 86, 123.

Gemara, 45-46, 88, 374, 376.

general will, 195-196.

Genesis, Book of, 21, 24, 43, 105, 115, 294.

genetic drift, 174.

genocide, 191, 322, 326-327, 335.,

German Disease, 248.

German Workers' Party (Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverein), 227.

Germany: culture, 160, 215; education, 167; and France, 202-203, 205; geography, 64, 123, 202; Jews, 207, 216, 229-230, 259, 326; philosophy and Enlightenment, 135; politics, 179, 182, 203, 206, 208-209, 227, 229-230; religion, 90, 152, 160, 183, 214.

global warming, 169

God: accountability of, 103, 105, creation of universe, 115, 132, 137; dwelling-place of, 42, of Israel, 24, 25; nature of, 25, 107-108, 114, 116, 135, 154, 251-252; relation to man, 108-109, 112, 125-127, 132, 154, 159, 248.

Golden Calf, 15, 367.

good works, 154, 157.

Gottingen University, 167.

Government Accounting Office, 360.

Governor's School, The, 358.

Grand Illusion (film by Jean Renoir), 320

Great Awakening: First, 164-165; Second, 165-166.

Great Depression, 264.

Great Society, 356.

Great War, see World War I.

Greece: geography 48, 60, 73; politics of ancient, 52, 74.

Greek: culture, philosophy and religion, 50, 52, 54, 102, 118, 123, 204; empire, 45, 50-51, 54, 59, 69-70, 73-74; and Jews, 79, 86, 115, 375; language, 204.

Grossdeutsch, 206, 215, 374.

Groton School, 245.

Group of 88, 232.

GRU (Soviet intelligence agency), 314.

Guide for the Perplexed, 115, 118.

Gulag, 237-238.

haddithah, 47.

halacha, 44-45, 47, 110, 374.

half-way covenant, 162, 165.

Hapsburgs, 202, 233.

Harvard: College, 161, 164-165; Law School, 264, 266, 268 270; University, 142, 264, 267, 269, 289, 304, 326.

Hasmonean Dynasty, 57, 67.

hate crime, 330, 370.
hate speech, 254, 365.
health care (U. S.), 298, 324.
Heidelberg University, 135, 260.
Hellenism, 50, 57, 375,
Hesbon, 27.
Hillul ha-Shem, 108, 375.
Hispanic(s), 361.
historical materialism, 176, 226.
Hoffaktor, 99, 375.
Hoffjude, 99, 375.
Holland, 98, 99, 119, 133-135, 158.
Hollywood, 222, 280-281, 367.
Holocaust: deniers, 274-275, 325; Jews as accomplices, 18 328-329, 344-345; Museum, 237-238; uses of, 370.
Holodomor: compared to Holocaust, 325-326, 330; denial of, 323; mentioned, 319, 321.
Holy Scripture, 43.
Homestead Strike, 241.
Horace Mann School, 273.
House Committee on Un-American Activities, 338.
house Jews, see Hoffjude, Hoffaktor, serf of the chamber.
Houston Holocaust Museum, 238.
Hungarian Republic, 234.
Hungary: Communism and, 235-236, 299; Jews of, 299, 321, 32, 342; mentioned, 123, 234-235, 237.
immunology, 175.
Indians (American), 162, 285, 332-335.
Indo-European, 38.
Industrial Areas Foundation, 355.
Industrial Revolution, 131, 206, 240.
Institutes of the Christian Religion, 125.
Iran, 73.
Ireland, 153, 155, 160.

Irish, 336.

Iroquois, 334, 351.

Islam, 47, 106, 112, 118, 124.

Islamic Law. See subentry "Sharia" under law.

isolationism, 308.

isonomia, 48.

Israel: ancient, 17, 19, 24-25, 28-30, 36, 39-41, 45, 50-52, 55, 59, 69-72, 74, 76-79, 81, 86-87, 106; geography, 20-21, modern state, 17; northern state, 17.

Istanbul, 76.

Isvestia, 276.

Jacobins, 198

Jena, Battle of, 203-204.

Jerusalem: ancient city, 30, 32, 34-35, 39-40, 42, 46, 51, 56-57, 59, 67-68, 80-81; geography, 28; medieval era, 95-96.

Jesuits, 183

Jewish Agency (Hungary), 328

Jewish Council (Hungary), 344.

Jewish Question, the, 217, 225.

Jews: American, 17-18, 77, 155, 264, 267-268, 272, 281; Ashkenazi, 13, 85, 87-91, 93, 96, 99, 119, 142, 157, 210; Blacks, 269, 290, 356; capitalists, 17; Communism, Marxism, 14, 123, 147, 189, 217-218, 220, 225, 282, 311, 314, 317-318, 321, 326-327, 333, 360, 367; diaspora, 13, 37-38, 40-42, 59, 76-78, 81, 83; France, 86, 200; Germany, 86, 187, 189, 205-207, 214-216, 230, 256-260, 262; Hungary, 117, 235, 275, 327-329, liberals, socialists, 12, 17, 144, 146, 274-275, 335, 367; Nazi collaborators, 344; orthodox, 24, 44, 46, 50, 54-55, 60, 77, 80, 106, 117, 214; Poland-Lithuania, 120-122, 237-238; secularized, 14, 51, 54-55, 78; self-hating/apostate, 78, 189, 213, 306; Sephardim, 87, 89, 93, 95, 122, 133, 156; slaughter/massacres, 96-98, 120, 122, 322, 326; tools, 23-24, 70, 99-100, 119, 184, 210-211.

Jordan River Valley, 20, 28.

Joseph to Pharaoh (paradigm), 12, 16, 21-23, 40-41, 71, 185, 207, 256, 268, 342, 362, 368.

Journalism: advocacy, 277; interpretive, 277; objective, 277; power of, 277; "value added," 277.

Judah (ancient state), 32-37.

Judaism: Orthodox, 99, 134, 268, 375; Rabbinic, 25, 45-46, 83; Reconstruction, 291; Reform, 215-216, 260; mentioned, 31, 47, 59, 81, 106, 118, 177, 192, 237.

Judas Iscariot, 329.

Judea (ancient state), 39-42, 45, 50-51, 55-56, 59-60, 67-68, 78, 80.

Judeofascist: def., 226; examples, 232, 297-298, 301, 314, 325, 335, 337, 339, 342.

justice: administrative, 146, 182, 207, 300, 303, 316; distributive, 139, 146, 179; general, 103, 121, 140, 258, 262, 328.

Kabbalah, 106-109, 120, 148, 375.

Kadesh-Barnea, 27.

Kiddush ha-Shem, 97, 375.

Kiel, 229.

King's Highway, 20, 32.

Kleindeutsch, 206, 215, 375.

Kohanim, 313.

Koran, 47.

Korea, 313, 161, 196, 180.

Korean War, 313

kulak(s), 322, 326.

L.S.C. See Legal Services Corporation.

labor theory of value, 249.

Lady Chatterley's Lover, 306.

law: common, 48; natural, 13, 39, 139, 144, 147, 153, 258-259; 330; positive, 38, 41, 62, 100, 145-146, 157, 168, 195, 198, 200, 218, 258-262, 330, 340, 360; religious, 39-40, 42, 44-48, 55, 83, 85, 97, 110, 115-117, 127, 134, 168, 187, 214; United States, 264-268, 270, 337-339; mentioned, 83, 100, 145-146, 240, 245.

League of Nations, 328.

Lebanon, 19.

left-wing agenda, 271.

left-wing fascism, 257.

Legal Services Corporation, 359-360.

legitimate prince, 179-181.

Lenin's boys, 234.

Leviathan, 237-138, 141.

Levites, 57, 213.

Leviticus, 24, 43.

Liberal Exemption, 368-369.

liberal(s): academics, 136, 196; courts, 236; Democrats, 249; Jews, 338, 265; media, 146, 222, 273, 276, 278-279, 322; organizations, 309; politicians, 63, 138, 169, 179, 196; programs, 307; Protestant, 135-136, 243, 356; white guilt, 254, 289, 356; mentioned, 235, 265, 272-273, 276, 307, 336.

liberalism (non-classical), 55, 165, 209, 228, 236, 273, 279, 299, 369.

liberty, 11, 14, 100, 144, 179-180, 182, 189, 195, 228, 230, 240, 259, 283, 287, 290-292, 307-308, 314, 330, 365-366, 368-371.

Lincoln School, 274.

Lithuania, 87, 99, 119, 363, 376.

Little Red School House, 332.

Lord's Supper, 162.

Lordship and Bondage, 175.

Los Angeles Times, 277, 279.

LSC, see Legal Services Corporation.

Lynne Stewart Defense Committee, 355.

Maccabees, 54, 56-57.

mafia (generic term), 65, 245, 263.

malignant personality, DSM IV definition, 349

Manhattan Institute, 292.

market forces, 265.

marriage: 14, 147, 168, 220, 233, 258; gay "marriage," 283.

Marx-Engels Institute, 257.

Marxism: and Jews, 117, 123, 148, 220, 256-257; as religion, 15, 136, 141, 177, 225, 332, 336, 358, 361; theory/philosophy, 15, 34, 193, 217, 237, 305, 320, 326.

mass jujitsu, 355.

mass murder, 229, 321-322, 326-327, 329-330.

Maus, 337.

Mayan, 334, 385.

McCarthyism, 311, 315.

Mecca, 75.

Medes, 38-39, 41, 73.

media: bias, 8, 132, 142-143, 146, 324, 361, 363; Jewish influence/control of, 143, 271, 280, 295, 298, 314-315, 323; power of, 271, 280-281, 322, 366.

Mediterranean Sea basin, 12, 19.

Mesopotamia, 19, 30, 32, 50, 60-61, 75, 93.
Methodist(s)/Methodism, 274, 356, 358, 374.
middleman, 223.
Midrash, 102-103, 105-106, 110, 374-375.
MiG-15, 313.
Mishnah, 44-47, 68, 375.
missionaries, 269.
mitziah, 274, 375.
monarchy: absolute, 61, 187, 191, 297; Biblical, 30, 37, 41; constitutional, 197, 200.
monasteries, 111, 170, 188.
money: abolition of, 147, 222; credit, 119, 207; free market, 256, Jews and, 23-24, 97, 99-100, 290, 357, 366; Papacy and, 125; power of, 138, 148, 151, 155, 160, 170, 197, 257, 308, 339, 345, 356-357, 359, 366, 372.
mongols, invasions of, 217, 320, 363.
moral insanity, 349.
Mt. Sinai, 16, 24-35, 43, 106-107, 375.
Munich, 181, 231.
Muslim(s): Black, 339; Conquest of Middle East, North Africa, and Spain, 89, 93, 95; law, 74; religion, 47, 75, 93, 115; rule, 88-89, 93, 95, 73.
myth, 280, 305.
NAACP, see National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
nanny state, 168, 191, 309.
Napoleonic Code, 200, 259.
Nation, The, 353
National Assembly (France), 197.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People: atheists and, 290; Crisis (official journal of), 276; Jews and, 269, 289-290; Niagara Movement, 288-89; Protestant elite, 269-270, 289.
National Lawyers' Guild, 360.
National Socialism, 259
National Welfare Rights Organization, 292.
nationalism, 52, 54-56, 203, 210, 237, 257, 367.
Native American(s), 194, 333, 335.
NATO, 373.

Nazis: anti-Semitism, 225; civil rights, 179, Jews, 322, 344; Jews as collaborators with, 344-345; legal system, 236, 259; Nuremberg Trials, 262, 325; Occupation of Europe, 317, 321-322, 326-327, 342; propaganda, 271.

Negroes, self-destructive behavior, 149, 288, cultural history, 287, 290; living conditions of (historical), 287; NAACP, 289; Niagara Movement, 288-289; self-help, 287; as tools of Left/Jewish Left, 149, 254, 283, 287, 289, 290-292, 301.

nervous system, 175.

Netherlands, see Holland.

New Deal, agencies, 265, 268; measures, 265, 273; personnel, 243, 311; general, 266, 305, 370.

New England, Calvinism, 156, 164, 264, 268; colonies, 126, 153; Congregational Church, 164; Protestant elite, 161, 165, 167-168, 204, 240, 247, 326; Unitarian, 204, 304.

New Jerusalem, 161, 324, 339.

New Lanark (Indiana), 170.

New Testament, 166.

New York City, 292, 337, 342, 352.

New York Times, 221, 271, 272, 274, 323, 324, 332, 367.

new-age religion, 248.

Niagara Movement, 287-290.

nihilism, 15, 225, 323.

Nile River Valley, 19, 61.

NKVD (Soviet intelligence agency), 313-314, 321.

noble experiment, 326.

noble savage, 194, 334-335.

North Africa, geography, 64, 74; and Jews, 78, 87-89, 93, 117.

North Korea, 161, 180, 196, 305, 323.

Numbers (Biblical text), 24, 43.

Nuremberg Laws, 259.

NWRO. See National Welfare Rights Organization.

Nye Committee report, 307-308.

ochlocracy, 198.

Oedipal challenge, 175.

Office of Strategic Services (OSS), 262, 313, 258.

OGPU (a Soviet secret police agency), 321.

Oil for Food Program, The, 363.
old left, 339-340.
old line agencies (Federal Government), 368, 311.
Old Testament, 17, 43, 106, 156, 166, 264, 367.
Open Society Institute, 353-355.
Oral Torah: see Mishnah
Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, The, 222, 306.
Orontes River, 27.
OSS. See Office of Strategic Services
Other, 90-91, 103, 120, 158, 177, 183, 226, 237.
Ottoman Empire, 75, 119, 122-123, 180, 229.
overspecialization, 174.
Palestine Liberation Organization, 360.
Palestine, 54, 59-60, 67, 73-75, 79, 83, 93, 98, 122, 328-329.
Papal Infallibility, 47.
particularism, 25, 31, 91, 215-216, 260, 274.
patricians, 62, 65.
Peloponnesian War; 50.
Pentateuch, 43-46, 107, 109-110.
Perfidy, 328, 331.
Perlo Ring, 311.
Persia: geography, 73; post-Muslim, 75, 77, 79, 88, 93, 363; Pre-Muslim, 74-75.
Persians, laws of, 38-39, 41; race, 38
perversion, 108, 174, 300, 326.
Pharisees, 57, 134.
Phenomenology of Spirit, The, 175, 203.
Philistines, 29-30.
philosophes, 192-193.
Pilgrims, 304.
Pink Orchestra, 222, 295, 366.
piranhas, 307.
Platonism, 50.
Plebeians, 62, 65.

Poland, Poles: under Communism, 236, 299, 312; geography, 99; and Jews, 237-238, 321-322, 363; 237, 299, 317.

Poland-Lithuania, 120-121, 376.

political correctness, 142, 198, 246, 253, 257, 299, 323, 326, 330, 366, 369.

Politics of Meaning, 361.

pomerium, 61.

popery, 155.

Populares, 63.

Portugal, 64, 98, 133-134, 376.

Potsdam, 184.

POW's, Soviet. Fate of, 312.

Pravda, 276.

precious vase phenomenon, 134.

predetermination, 154, 159.

Presbyterian(s), 127, 161, 274.

printing press, 152.

private property, 145, 147, 222, 235.

production, means of, 176, 265.

Professoriate, Dictatorship of 222, 267.

Progressive: schools, 273-274, 332; in general, 236, 307, 309, 339, 358.

Prop Nine, 360.

protected class, 330-331.

protected Jews, 184.

Protestant elite, see New England

Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, The, 158.

Protestant Left, 269, 288-293, 295, 308, 326.

Protestant: in Germany, 214, 231; mainline churches, 168-169, 269, 288, universities, 131, 136; mentioned, 47, 90, 124, 126, 156, 158, 241, 247, 251, 254, 374.

Prussia: and Austria, 208, 211; Bismarck, 228; Frederick the Great, 179, 182, 185, 193; industrialization of, 205, 210; Jews, 184, 208; religion, 183, 186, 231; state, 182, 189, 201-203, 205-206, 208, 215, 228, 231, 286.

Puerto Ricans, 361.

Pulitzer Prize Board, 324

Pulitzer Prize, 221, 323-324.

Puritans, 155, 168-169, 246, 264, 268.
rabbis (as a class), 40, 45, 57, 216, 329.
racism, 169-170, 287, 336, 354.
rap music, 293-294.
Rechstaat. See law, positive.
red diaper babies, 222, 332.
Red Sea: geography, 20, 32; general, 30.
Reformation, Protestant, 124, 152.
regional alliances, 372.
regulative principles, 136, 223.
Reichstag, 227, 229, 262.
Reign of Terror: Bavaria, 232, France, 198-199, 236; Poland, 238; Russia, 199.
religion, "experiential," 164.
religiosity, 290.
Repressive Tolerance, 297, 370.
Republic, The, 294.
respectables, 329.
responsibilities (v. rights), 288-289.
revelation, 24, 107, 112, 115, 154, 224.
Revolt of the Dwarves, 304.
Revolution: American, 165, 197; French (1789), 200-201, 286, 356; French (1848), 272; Russian, 262, 322.
revolutionary movements: in US, 165, 197, 354-355, 339-340, mentioned, 176, 227, 229, 232, 322, 354-355.
Rhine (river): geography, 86, 89, 99, 123, 202-203; mentioned, 81, 90, 96, 123, 202.
Righteous Gentiles. See Yad Vashem.
Righteous Jews, 327.
Rights of Man, 286.
Rochester Theological Seminary (currently Colgate Crozier Divinity School), 248.
Roman Catholic: Church, 47, 88-89, 126, 170, 180; Religion, 123-124, 156.
Roman: Empire, 74-75, 77, 79, 88-89, 99, 111, 124, 259; Republic, 88, 290; law, 200.
Romania, 64, 123-124, 235.
Romanians, 201, 234.

romanticism, 167.

Russia: Muscovite, 76, 87; pre-revolutionary, 76, 191, 237, 289; post-revolutionary, 142, 176, 199, 235, 262-263, 299.

sacred weapon, 187-188.

salami tactics, 366.

Salamis, Battle of, 148.

salvation, 125, 127, 154, 157, 159, 162, 183, 224, 251.

Sanhedrin, 67, 376.

Sans Souci, 184.

Sassanid dynasty, 74-75.

scholasticism, 112.

scientific socialism. See under socialism.

Scotland, 141-142, 151, 158, 161.

Second Amendment, 306.

Second Scripture, see Mishnah.

Second Temple, 39, 41, 45, 76, 80, 86, 106, 375.

Section Eight Housing, 169, 369.

Secular Humanism, 127, 130, 156, 165.

Sefer Yetzirah, 170.

Sefirot, 107.

SEIU. See Service Employees International Union.

Sephardim, 87, 89, 119.

serf of the chamber, 99.

serfdom, 286, 373.

Service Employees International Union, 356-357.

Sharia, 47, 374.

Shechem, 32.

Shekhinah, 108-109.

Shtetls, 214, 376.

Silvermaster Group, 312.

Skokie, IL, 306.

slavery, 21, 86, 166, 194, 285-287, 289, 291, 335, 358.

Smith College, 303.

social class, 183, 185, 191, 199, 204.

Social Contract, 195.

Social Democratic Party. See SPD.

Social Gospel, 165, 167-168, 247-249.

social terrorism, 293.

Socialism: Marxist/scientific, 25, 167, 176, 235; religious, 165, 170, 247, 376; state, 108, 227, 231, 242, 259, 291; utopian, 176, 361; mentioned, 145, 174, 224, 233, 305.

Socialist(s), 196, 222, 227-228, 231, 282, 289, 326.

sociopath, DSM IV definition, 346, 350, 352, 353.

Soros Foundation Network, 354.

Soros on Soros, 346, 351, 353.

Soros Phenomenon, 256.

Sovereign, 140, 142-143, 145-146.

Soviet Union, 139, 161, 234, 262, 266, 268, 301, 312, 337, 376.

Spanish Inquisition, 354.

Sparta, 49.

Spartacist League (Spartakusbund), 230.

SPD: See Social Democratic Party (German), 227, 229-231.

spy, spying, see espionage.

State Department, 266, 268, 311, 316, 326.

Stiften, def., 136.

stoicism, 50.

Subjects of the Emperor, 211.

Sunni, 47.

Syria: geography, 27, 74; general, 19, 59, 64, 67, 74-75, 80.

talented tenth, 286.

Talmud, 46, 115, 216, 374, 376.

Tanakh, 43, 46, 376.

Taxation, 177, 184, 196-197, 253, 293, 370-371.

Teachers College of Columbia University, 274.

teachers' colleges, 244.

Temple, First: 33, 35-37, 108, 375; Second, 39-42, 45, 51-52, 55, 57, 59, 68-70, 76, 79-81, 83, 86, 106, 367, 375.

theist, 252.

theology, 113, 126, 163, 248, 267.

Theosophy, 246.

thesmos, 48.

Third Estate, 197.

Third Reich, 229, 257.

Thirteen Principles of Faith, 117.

Tigris River Valley, 19, 61.

Tikkun, 106, 122, 361, 376.

Torah, 14, 24-25, 39-40, 43-45, 108-110, 113, 115-117, 213.

transcendentalism, 165, 167.

transcendentalists, 171.

Turkey: geography, 19, 73; general, 76, 88.

Two Treatises on Government, 144.

tyranny/tyrannies, 14, 16, 39, 52, 146, 177, 230, 236, 355, 363, 365-368, 373.

U. N. see United Nations.

U. S. see United States.

Ukraine, 121, 144, 238-239, 319, 321-323, 326-327.

Unitarianism, 106, 164-165, 249.

United Nations, 363, 366, 371-372.

United States: Constitution, 286; culture, 98, 132, 282, 304, 317, 342, 366; economy, 120; haven (for Jewish refugees), 257, 297, 341; Jewish Left, 11, 135, 230, 266, 292, 299, 301, 321, 333, 341-342; religion, 327; slavery, 287.

University of California, Berkeley, 261.

USSR. See Soviet Union.

utilitarianism, 355.

utopia, utopian socialism: 155, 176-177, 221, 225, 232, 253, 300-301, 321, 334, 361.

Venona Project, 311, 315-318, 337.

Via Maris, 20, 32.

Vietnam, 254, 269, 277.

Violence: drug culture and, 293; legal context, 145-146; mob, 339; political, 299, 350; social, 305. *volonté générale*, see "General Will."

Wars of the Iroquois, The, 334.

Washington Post, 277-278.
Washington, DC, 265, 267, 283.
WASPS, see Protestant élite.
Weimar Republic, 232, 260.
weirdos, 304,
Welfare Rights Organization, 256, 259, 291-292, 371.
welfare state, 228, 265, 372.
welfare, 138, 293-294, 356, 365, 369.
Wellesley College, 358.
Weltanschauung, 158, 160.
Western civilization, 112, 149.
Westminster Confession, 157.
Wheeling, W. VA., 316.
White Jews. def., 226, 269.
white man's burden, 246.
works, good, 154, 157.
World Trade Center, 341, 354.
World War I, 229-300, 233-234, 237, 303, 308, 320,
World War II., 201, 237-238, 325, 345, 372.
worldly asceticism, 159.
Yad Vashem, 327,
Yalta Conference, 312.
Yiddish (language), 120, 210, 294, 376.
Zohar, 107, 375
Zollverein, 206.